

FACTS

FOR

THE PEOPLE;

SHOWING THE RELATIONS OF THE

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO

SLAVERY, - &c.

EMBRACING A

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN WAR,

ITS ORIGIN AND OBJECTS.

COMPILED FROM OFFICIAL AND OTHER AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS.

BY LORING MOODY.

BOSTON:

ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 21 CORNHILL.

LOW AND JACKSON'S ANTI-SLAVERY PRESS,

14 Devonshire Street

1847.



P R E F A C E.

Many valuable works on the relation of the government of the United States to Slavery, have already been given to the public. Among which are, "A View of the Action of the Federal Government," by William Jay; "Rights of the Free States Subverted," by Joshua Giddings; and, "The Slave Power," by John G. Palfrey. The editions of these, however, are quite exhausted; and for many reasons it is of great importance that the facts contained in them should be condensed into a single volume. New developments of the workings of Slavery through its grand agent, the government, are every day occurrences; and as the most remarkable of these are embodied in the commencement and progress of the war upon Mexico, I have collected from various sources some of the most prominent facts in the slaveholding relations of the government—including enough of the history of the annexation of Texas, and the Mexican War, to exhibit in a clear light that the sole object of the nation, in the acquisition of the one, and the prosecution of the other, is, the extension and perpetuation of human bondage.

In the preparation of this work, I have been materially aided by the above mentioned publications, for which I have taken great pleasure in giving credit. The facts contained in this book, and the positions which they are

summoned to establish, are believed to be incontrovertible. They are based upon official documents which are conclusive on the points to which they refer. And we shall challenge the history of the world in vain for another spectacle of such hypocrisy and wickedness as that presented by this nation. It is true, that among the more savage tribes of Africa wars are still carried on for the purpose of adding to the victims of slavery. But these wars are mainly, though in part indirectly chargeable upon the Americans; who, though they have denounced the foreign traffic, still give their countenance and encouragement to the trade, by keeping *open markets for human flesh* in the *Capitol*, and most of the principal towns and cities of more than half the States of the Union, and make the "protection, extension and perpetuation of slavery, the vital and animating principle of the government." But the Americans profess to be somewhat better than savages. They profess to be republicans—democrats; and to believe in the natural equality of all men. That they are all created with an *inalienable* right to *freedom*. They also baptize themselves in the name of *Christ*. They call themselves a *Christian* nation; and their Chief Magistrate, it is said, is "a man of *prayer*." And they are girdling the Earth with operations for the extension of their own ideas and practices. But, while the civilized world is awaking to a juster appreciation of human rights, and adopting measures for the advancement of human welfare, by taking steps for the progressive abolition of old systems of oppression, the United States are carrying on a most bloody and atrocious war, for the purpose of crushing to the earth the best and fondest aspirations of the human soul, by enlarging the area, and piling up, and making strong and impregnable the frightful Bastile of Slavery.

Few Americans are aware of the support the despotisms of the Old World derive from the system of slavery existing in this country. A few years ago the Chartists of England and Scotland were shaking the United Kingdom with their agitations in behalf of an extension of the political franchise. They declared that the people were capable of self-government; and demanded that they should have the same rights in the choice of their own legislators, as are enjoyed in the United States. And with the Constitution of these States, and their Declaration of Independence in their hands, as exponents of their views, they were doing much for the advancement of their great cause. But they were met by the friends of Monarchy, and the people were told to beware of them. That in the United States, whose institutions were so much lauded, *three millions of the people were SLAVES. That their wives were torn from them and sold at public auction, and their children by the pound; and that bad as their condition was, the tallest Peer in the realm dare not rob them of either wife or child. That, though poor, they were not slaves.* But the design of these agitators was to make them slaves, as their reference to the American government clearly proved.

An American gentleman,* while on a tour through Great Britain, in the summer of 1846, visited the tower of London, and by the payment of a fee was shown the Queen's jewels, and among other things, her crown. While looking at the costly bauble, he was told by the lady who had it in charge, that the jewels with which it was studded cost three millions of pounds sterling. Feeling his Republican spirit stir within him, he said, he "thanked God he did not live in a country where one woman wore

* James M. Buffum, of Lynn, Mass.

three millions of pounds on her head,* while others were starving for the want of potatoes." "Well," said an old sailor who was standing near, "you may thank God for what you please, but I thank him that I do not live in a land where 'All men are born free and equal,' and three millions are slaves."

In one of James Brooks' "Letters from Europe," he says, that during the reign of proslavery mobocracy in this country in 1835—6, the Emperor of Austria left it optional with some criminals to be sentenced to the galleys, or banished to the United States.

Were the people of this nation and their institutions really what they profess to be, they would challenge the respect and admiration of the world. Instead of which, their hypocrisy only excites its disgust. And the king-ridden and priest-ridden subjects of Europe are made to bear their burdens in comparative silence, through fear of increasing their miseries in any efforts to better their condition, by attempting to throw off the despotisms under which they are groaning. They are not now bought and sold like dumb beasts in the market; but they are told that millions of the poor are so disposed of in this country; and that such must inevitably be their fate under a government copied from the United States of America.

This little book is sent forth upon its errand, in the hope, that so far as it is read, it may aid in unmasking the hypocrisy of a nation which more than any other strengthens the hands of tyrants and oppressors throughout the world. As a literary production it claims no merit. But its facts are unhesitatingly submitted to public scrutiny.

Boston, May, 1847.

L. M.

* 14,490,000 dollars.

INDEX.

| | Page |
|---|--------|
| Adams, J. Q. | 27 |
| Address of Texas Settlers, | 66 |
| Advertiser, N. Y. Commercial, | 55, 66 |
| " Mobile, | 64 |
| Albany Argus, | 70 |
| Annexation, Bill for, Benton's, | 94 |
| " Resolve for, | 95 |
| " Speeches on | 61 |
| " Toasts on, | 65, 92 |
| Arkansas Gazette, | 64 |
| Army and Navy Chronicle, | 74 |
| Attempts to obtain fugitives from Mexico, | 33 |
| Austin, Moses, | 56 |
| " Stephen F's letter, | 65 |
| Austin Democrat, | 111 |
| Baker's Speech, | 121 |
| Benton, Thomas H. | 60 |
| Benton's Speech, | 89 |
| " letter to Texan Congress, | 89 |
| Bocanegra's letter, | 80 |
| Boundary of Texas, | 55, 89 |
| British Commissioner's Report of, | 69 |
| Canada, Efforts to obtain Fugitives from, | 29 |

| | <i>Page.</i> |
|---|--------------|
| Calhoun's Letters to Packenham, | 87 |
| " Speech, | 128 |
| Claims for Mexican Spoliations, | 98 |
| Charleston Courier, | 124 |
| Colonization Laws of Texas, | 63 |
| Commerce, Journal of, | 81 |
| Complaint of Texas Plotters, | 68 |
| Constitution of Coahuila and Texas, | 69 |
| Crimes and Outrages, | 109 |
| Debates on Panama Mission, | 39 |
| " on the Wilnot Proviso," | 126 |
| " on the Creole Case, | 33 |
| Decrees of Mexico abolishing Slavery, | 62 |
| Edgefield Carolinian, ? . . . | 60 |
| Efforts to prevent Emancipation in Cuba, | 37 |
| England, Treaties with, | 25 |
| Florida, Invasion of, | 18 |
| " Purchase of, | 20 |
| " Treaty, | 56 |
| Florida War, | 22 |
| Freemont's Exploring Expedition, | 97 |
| Gaines, General, | 73 |
| Gazeteer, Brooks' | 45 |
| Haile's Letter, | 110 |
| Hayti, Relations to | 41 |
| " Constitution of, | 45 |
| " Exports from, | 46 |
| " Debates on, | 43 |
| History, Ramsey's, | 25 |
| Horrors of the War, | 113 |
| Henry Clay's Instruction to Anderson and Sargent, | 38 |
| " " " " J. R. Poise", | 58 |
| Indian Relations, | 10 |

| | Page. |
|--|----------------------------|
| Insurrection, Southampton, | 34 |
| Jefferson, Thomas, | 26, 54 |
| Kearney's Proclamation, | 106 |
| Land Companies, | 59 |
| Letter of Henry Clay, | 74, 77 |
| " " " " to Everett, | 39 |
| " " James K. Polk, | 79 |
| " " Martin Van Buren, | 75, 78 |
| " " Upsher to Murphy, | 84 |
| " " Gen. Taylor to War Department, | 101 |
| " " Marcy to Taylor, | 99, 100 |
| " " Marcy to Stephenson, | 123 |
| Mexican Character, | 138 |
| " Indemnities, | 98 |
| Monterey, Battle of, | 109 |
| New York Herald, | 82 |
| Oceola, | 23 |
| Oregon, | 127 |
| Pensacola Gazette, | 73 |
| Polk's Messages, | 52, 98, 105, 106, 122, 136 |
| Ringgold, Major, | 116 |
| Scott's Mexican "Safeguard," | 132 |
| " Proclamation, | 135 |
| Slidell, John, Letter of, | 103 |
| Spirit of the Times, Letter to, | 104 |
| Taylor's Proclamation, | 108 |
| Texas and the War, | 52 |
| " Constitution, | 96 |
| " Efforts to obtain Possession of, | 58 |
| " Necessities of, | 82, 89 |
| Tyler, John, Messages of, | 87, 88, 89, 98 |
| Tribune, N. Y., Letter to, | 115 |

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

WE the people of the United States, in order to establish justice, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution.—*Preamble to Constitution of the United States.*

Such was the pledge. The people have waited in vain for its redemption. To more than three millions of them its words are the bitterest mockery. They are bought and sold like cattle in the market. They are scourged to unpaid toil. The tenderest ties of life are torn remorselessly asunder, by men calling themselves Christians, under the sanction of a constitution and government, formed for the purpose of establishing JUSTICE!

The main object of this work, is to present, in a condensed form, some of the most prominent instances in which this nation has sold itself to work iniquity by legislating and carrying on wars in behalf of slavery.

The United States—twelve out of the thirteen slaveholding—entered on their career as a nation bound by a compact, not to prohibit the foreign slave-trade until the home market could be supplied by the domestic:—to give up the soil of the whole country as hunting-ground upon which the slave-holders might chase down the flying

bondman :—to allow a representation in Congress based upon three-fifths of all the slaves in the land, and to aid the master, by bullet and bayonet if need be, to keep his slaves in subjection.*

With such a beginning, strange that any should fail of seeing the end. Having thus received the bantling under its protection, the next business of the government was, to provide for its future wants. Slavery has shared largely in its provisions, and fattened on its bounties, until the little one has become a giant, whose tread shakes the nation. Before it, the questions of Peace and War, Banks, Tariffs and Sub-Treasuries are as the small dust of the balance.

The Constitution had hardly been ratified by the people, and the government gone into operation under it, when Congress began to legislate, and the President and Senate to make treaties for the better security of slavery. The fathers of the Republic had fought through a seven year's war with Great Britain, because—as they declared —“ God had created all men EQUAL ;” and after having wiped the blood and dust of this battle in behalf of *Liberty* from their brows, they sat down in their legislative capacity, and commenced, on a large scale, the business of forging manacles for the limbs of slaves.

Some of the methods in which the powers of the Federal Government have been employed for this purpose, will now be mentioned.

Indian Relations.

“ On the 7th August, 1790, the United States concluded a treaty with the Creek Indians, in which they dis-

* See Art. I, Sec. 2 & 9, and Art. IV, Sec. 2 & 4, Con. U. S.

tinctly agreed to deliver up the negroes then residing within their territory, *to the officers of the United States*; and if not delivered on or before the first day of June following the date of the treaty, the Governor of Georgia was authorized to appoint three persons to repair to the Indian country to demand them."

"For this and other stipulations on the part of the Indians, the United States agreed to pay them an annuity of fifteen hundred dollars, together with certain goods mentioned in the treaty."*

Many of these slaves had run away from their masters, while they were fighting for *liberty*: and having obtained that, after a long and severe struggle, they turned their attention to the very laudable undertaking of reducing them to bondage again.

"But the Indians neglected to deliver the negroes; and on the 31st December, 1795, the Secretary of War communicated to the President the fact, that the Indians had disregarded their compact, and advised that the slaves be paid for by the United States.†

This communication was sent to the Senate and House of Representatives by the President on the 12th January following, but no final action appears to have taken place at that time.‡ On the 29th of June, 1796, another treaty was entered into between the United States and the Creek Indians, called 'the treaty of Coleraine.' By the terms of this latter treaty, the Indians again covenanted to deliver up to the officers of the United States, such negroes as were resident in their nation; and if they were not delivered by the first day of January next following the date of the treaty, then the Governor of Georgia was authorized to appoint three persons to repair to the Creek nation and demand said negroes *under direction of the President of the United States*.§ In consideration of this and other stipulations, the United States covenanted to pay the Indians six thousand dollars in goods, and to fur-

* Laws of the United States, 1 vol., 359.—6th American State Papers, 81. † 5 American State Papers, 546. ‡ American State Papers, vol. 5, page 546. § American State Papers, vol. 5, page 586. Laws U. S., vol. 1, page 363.

nish them with two blacksmiths and strikers, tools, &c. It should also be understood, that at the conclusion of this treaty, many of the slaves from the 'Upper Creek Towns' were brought in, and delivered to the officers of Government, who acted with the Indians as the assistant catchpolls of southern slaveholders."*

"The slaves of Georgia, however, continued to flee from bondage, and to seek an asylum among the Indians; and many who had left prior to the treaty of 1790, remained in the Indian country, intermarried with the Seminoles, or 'Southern Creeks,' and became permanently incorporated with various bands known as the 'Florida Indians.'"†

‡ The people and government of Georgia were constantly making efforts to get the United States to obtain a return of the slaves who were living with the Indians; but these efforts proved of little use, as the Indians neglected to restore any of them.‡ In 1802, a general law regulating intercourse between the people of the United States and the Indian tribes, was enacted by Congress. By the terms of this law, the agent for paying annuities was authorized to retain from the annuities of any tribe, the value of any property taken from the white people by Indians belonging to such tribe.§ Under this law, it is said, that a compensation was retained by the agent of the United States, for all slaves who left their masters, and went to unite with the Indians, subsequent to the passage thereof. On this point the writer speaks from verbal information, and not from official documents. It is, however, certain, that the people of Georgia could neither get the negroes who had left their masters prior to the passage of the law, nor could they obtain compensation for their loss. They therefore became importunate in their demands upon the Federal Government, to interfere more effectually for the protection of Slavery in that State. The Executive finally determined to make another effort to aid the slaveholders of Georgia in obtaining their slaves, or to extort from the Indians a compensation for their loss.¶ To effect this object, arrangements were made by the Executive of the United States and the

* Vide 6 vol. American State Papers, page 252. † House Doc. 271, 1st Ses., 24th Congress. ‡ 5 American State Papers, 249. § Laws U. S., 2 vol., 360. ¶ 6 American State Papers, 248, 257.

Executive of Georgia, for negotiating another treaty with the Indians; at the making of which, the state of Georgia should be represented by her authorized agents, in order that the claims of her slaveholders should be duly regarded.* Instructions were given to the commissioners, who negotiated the treaty on the part of the United States, to lend to the agents of Georgia every aid that might tend to effect the object of their mission."†

"The commissioners on the part of the United States, and those on the part of Georgia, met the chiefs, warriors and head men of the Creeks, at 'Indian Spring,' about the 25th December, 1821. On the 27th, the commissioners of Georgia delivered their talk to the Indians, in which they assured the Indians, that '*in order to keep the chain of friendship bright between the white and red people, it was necessary that they should do JUSTICE TO EACH OTHER.*' They then reminded the Indians of their stipulation to return negroes, contained in the treaties of New York and Coleraine, and delivered to the Indians a list of their claims.‡ The next day, Gen. McIntosh, principal chief, replied, that 'he did not know that he was called here to answer for the claims of Georgia, until they had received the talk of the commissioners yesterday—that most of the items he knew nothing about.' That Gen. McGilvery, who negotiated the treaty of New York more than thirty years before, when he returned, informed their people that they were to deliver up the negroes then in the nation; but they were not to be liable for any that were dead or removed. That many of them were collected at the time of the treaty of Coleraine, and delivered to the agent of the United States. That others were subsequently delivered to Col. Hawkins, who never mentioned to them any claim under the treaty of Coleraine, but mentioned that of New York. That many of the negroes had been carried away by the British at the close of the war; that in 1816, many of these negroes were in the fort on the Apalachicola river; that most of them were killed, and those that were not killed were delivered to Colonel Clinch—and many of the negroes had gone into Florida

* 6 American State Papers, 254. † 6 American State Papers, 250.
‡ 6 American State Papers, 251.

among the Seminoles. That he had himself, with his warriors, joined Gen. Jackson's army, and gone with them into Florida, where they took some of those negroes, and delivered them to the agent of the United States; and that others still remained among the Seminoles. That if the President admitted that country to belong to the Creeks, he would take his warriors and go and bring up as many as they could get, and deliver them up to the United States. He thought the Creeks had fairly complied with their treaties in good faith."*

"In reply to this, the commissioners of Georgia insisted that the Indians ought to pay for the negroes carried away by the British at the close of the war, and for those among the Seminoles, *'and for the increase of all that had taken up their residence among the Indians.'* This demand was rejected by the Indians. It was, however, agreed to refer all the claims of Georgia against the Indians to the President,† and a stipulation was made in the treaty, by which the United States were to hold \$250,000 due from the United States to the Indians, in trust for the payment of such claims as the President should regard just and proper.‡ The President took upon himself the discharge of thus estimating the value of the slaves, and the propriety of paying for their increase. Commissioners were appointed for that purpose, who, after full examination, estimated the amount that should be paid to the slaveholders of Georgia, in full of all demands, at \$101,000. This sum, according to the report of Mr. Wirt, Attorney General of the United States, was made up by estimating the price of the negroes at two or three times their real value.§ This money being paid over to the owners of slaves, left in the hands of the Government \$149,000 belonging to the Indians. That amount was retained by Government for some years, until the owners of slaves having already received two or three times their real value, petitioned Congress to distribute the remaining sum among them as an additional compensation. Congress made the appropriation, and the money was paid to them, and the Indians were thus defrauded by the General Government of \$149,000, in

*6 American State Papers, 252. †6 American State Papers, 256. ‡6 American State Papers, 249. § Ex. Doc., 1st Ses., 26th Congress, vol. 6, No. 123.

order to enrich the slaveholders of Georgia, in addition to paying two or three times the real value of the negroes."*

"It should be borne in mind, that these things were transacted at a period when all Southern statesmen very correctly denied that '*Congress or the Federal Government possessed any powers whatever in relation to slavery.*' During a period of more than thirty years was the influence of the Federal Government exerted for the purpose of obtaining these fugitive slaves, or in extorting from the Indians a compensation for their owners. The Senate were called upon to approve those treaties, Congress was called on to pass laws, and to appropriate money to carry those treaties into effect, and the people of the free States to pay the money and bear the disgrace, in order that slavery may be sustained. But the consequences of these efforts still continue, and the Government has to this day been unable to extricate itself from the difficulties into which these exertions in behalf of slavery precipitated it. And the people of the free States are to this day taxed and dishonored, in consequence of these violations of their constitutional rights. These facts will be more fully illustrated when we examine our subsequent relations with the Seminoles and Creeks. But we will now look to our separate *treaties with the Seminole Indians.*"

"The first treaty between the United States and these Indians bears date at 'Camp Moultrie,' September 18th, 1823. By this treaty the United States agreed to pay them \$6,000, and an annuity of five thousand for twenty years; besides \$1,000 yearly for twenty years, to be expended in the support of a school, and the like sum for the same period to be expended in the support of a gun and blacksmith."

"By the 7th article of said treaty, the Indians obligated themselves '*to be vigilant and active in preventing the retreating to or passing through the district of country assigned them, of any absconding slaves or fugitives from justice.*' They further stipulated '*to use all necessary exertions to apprehend and deliver such fugitive slaves to the agent of the United States.*'"†

"Before we proceed further, it will be well to caution

* Laws U. S., 9 vol., 117. † Vide treaty, 7 vol., U. S. Laws, 708.

the reader to bear in mind the historical fact, that, prior to the making of this treaty with the Seminole Indians in 1823, they had been regarded as a portion of the Creek tribe, from whom they separated, and were therefore called 'Seminoles,' or 'runaways.' It has already been stated that a large portion of these slaves who had left Georgia prior to 1802, had united with these bands of Seminoles, had intermarried, and become incorporated with them. They had been paid for by the Creeks at the rate of five or six times their real value, and the Creeks having paid their money for them, sent their agents among the Seminoles to demand them as slaves, not doubting that they had derived a good title to them and their offspring, from the Government of the United States.* But the Seminoles, unwilling to surrender their wives and children to the Creeks, and being vexed and harassed with these and other demands made upon them for slaves, were induced to enter into the treaty of 'Payne's Landing,' in May, 1832, by which they stipulated to remove West, and re-unite with the Creeks. The 7th article of that treaty is in the following words :

'The Seminoles, being anxious to be relieved from repeated vexatious demands for slaves, (and other property alleged to have been stolen or destroyed by them,) so that they may remove unembarrassed to their new homes, the United States stipulate to have the same properly investigated, and to liquidate such as may be satisfactorily established, provided the amount does not exceed seven thousand dollars.' "†

"The Creeks, however, were not satisfied with this arrangement, but continued to press the Seminoles to surrender their wives and children, as the property of the Creeks."

"It will be recollected that the Seminoles had agreed in the treaty to remove West, and to re-unite with the Creeks. But to emigrate under such circumstances would be to place themselves in the power of the Creeks, who would thus gain possession of those whom they claimed as slaves, but who were in truth wives and children of the Seminoles. They therefore preferred to remain and

* Vide Report of Wiley Thompson, agent of the United States for the Seminole Indians, E. Doc. 125, 3d Session, 25th Congress.
† See Treaty of "Payne's Landing, 9 vol., U. S. Laws, 1240.

fight the whites, rather than go to the west, and permit their wives and children to become slaves. They were, however, overpowered, and compelled to emigrate. But when carried west of Arkansas, they dared not go into the Creek country, but settled down upon the territory belonging to the Cherokees. Here they remained. The Cherokees protested against this act of the Seminoles. The Creeks were anxious to have the Seminoles remove within their jurisdiction, in order to get their slaves, which they had purchased so dearly of the Federal Government, while the Seminoles dared not place themselves in the power of the Creeks; and during several years this triangular contention kept those tribes in a state of turmoil, and almost constantly threatened them and the United States with war. This state of things was wholly brought about by the efforts of our Government to obtain pay for the fugitive slaves of Georgia. The Executive was not an idle spectator of these facts. Efforts were constantly made to arrange the difficulty, but without success, until December last, when it is said that a treaty was effected between the United States on one part, the Cherokees of another part, the Creeks of another part, and the Seminoles of the fourth part. We are entirely indebted to reports communicated through the public press, and received from officers of Government, in respect to this treaty and its terms. It has not been officially made known to the people. But so far as we are able to learn, the treaty provides: 1. that the Seminoles shall leave the Cherokee lands, and shall settle upon the tract assigned to the Creeks. 2. Their wives and children and husbands shall remain free. 3. The Seminoles shall pay to the Creeks, for their wives, husbands, and children, such sums as shall be awarded by the President of the United States. The first and last treaty with those southern Indians were negotiated for the benefit of slavery; indeed, most of our treaties with them since 1789, have contained some provisions for the benefit of the slave-holding interest.”—*Rights of the free States subverted, by J. R. Giddings.*

Soon after the last war with England in 1815, the fugitive slaves began to assemble on the east side of the Apalachicola River, about fifteen miles from its mouth.

Here they erected a mud fort, collected provisions, cleared plantations, and commenced the business of farming. "They soon attracted the attention of the slave-holders, who became alarmed at these indications of freedom. Reports were made to the President, of the dangerous character of these fugitives."—Dangerous, because they were demonstrating to the world, that by honest industry, they were abundantly able to "take care of themselves." "Their sole object was to live in the quiet and peaceful enjoyment of freedom. Military officers of the United States directed their attention to this state of things; and a correspondence occupying many pages in regard to this settlement, may be found among the executive documents of the 2d session of the 15th Congress." In a letter of Com. Patterson to the Secretary of the Navy relating to the destruction of this fort, dated August 15th, 1816, he says:—

"The forces were daily increasing, and they felt themselves so strong and secure that they had commenced several plantations on the fertile banks of the Apalachicola, which would have yielded them every article of sustenance, and which would consequently in a short time have rendered their establishment quite formidable, and highly injurious to the neighboring states."*

"On the 15 of March, 1816, Mr. Crawford, then Secretary of War, issued orders to General Jackson, directing him to notify the Commander of Pensacola that such a fort existed; 'and was occupied by some two hundred and fifty or three hundred negroes, who inveigled the slaves from the frontier of Georgia; and that if it should be determined that the subject did not require the interference of Congress, measures would be taken for its destruction.' General Jackson issued orders to General Gaines 'to destroy the fort, and to restore the negroes to their owners.' General Gaines issued his orders to Col.

* St. Pap. Ses. 15th Cong., v. 6, No. 119, p. 12.

Clinch, who advanced within a mile or two of the fort, and attempted a cannonade, but appears to have failed in making any impression upon it. At the same time, Commodore Patterson had despatched two gun boats for the reduction of this fortress. They ascended the river took their positions opposite the fort, and, by firing hot shot, blew it up. There were about two hundred and eighty negroes, including women and children, in the Fort, together with some twenty Indians. Of the whole number, two hundred and seventy were killed, and several others mortally wounded.”*

“Among them, were some of those fugitives who had left their masters in Georgia, prior to 1790, and for whom the Creek Indians subsequently paid four or five times their real value, as heretofore shown. Those who were neither killed nor mortally wounded, were seized by our troops, and restored to their masters.† No act or offence against the United States is alleged against these people, except that they fled from slavery. For that alone they were thus murdered by the Federal Government.—

“The deep damnation of their taking off,”

rests on the people of the free, as well as of the slave States.”—*Rights of the free States subverted.*

In the letter of Com. Patterson to the Secretary of the Navy above referred to, he says:—

“The service rendered by the destruction of this fort, and the band of negroes who held it, is of great and manifest importance to those states bordering on the Creek nation, as it had become the general rendezvous of runaway slaves,—an asylum where they were assured of being received.”

And this “Democratic and Christian NATION,” was so well pleased with this unprovoked and cold blooded butchery, that in 1829, thirteen years afterwards, Congress voted five thousand dollars to the officers and crews of these gun boats.

* See Com. Patterson’s Report, 2d Ses., 15th Cong. † See Ex Doc. 2d Ses., 15th Cong.

Purchase of Florida.

It will be remembered, that Florida at this time constituted no part of the United States. It was a province of Spain, inhabited and governed by Spaniards. True, it was a slaveholding province: but slavery under the government of monarchical Spain, was quite a different thing from slavery in republican America.

In Judge Stroud's work on Slavery, we find the following:—"The indulgent treatment of their slaves, by which the Spaniards are so honorably distinguished, and the ample and humane code of laws which they have enacted, and also *enforce*, for the protection of the blacks, both bond and free, occasion many of the Indian slaves of East Florida, who were apprehensive of falling into the power of the Americans; and also most of the free people of color who resided at St. Augustine, to transport themselves to *Havanna, on the approach of the American authorities*;"* (i. e., to take possession of the territory after its purchase.)

The Indians also, who knew little of republicanism—less of "our holy religion,"—and who were not much better acquainted with our "free institutions," treated their slaves as brethren. In a letter of Gen. Thompson, dated April 27, 1835, he says:—

"The negroes in the nation DREAD the idea of being sold from their present state of ease and comparative liberty to bondage and hard labor under overseers on sugar and cotton plantations. They have always had a great influence on the Indians. An Indian would almost as soon sell his child as his slave."

* Laws relating to Slavery, p. 101.

The barbarous murder on the banks of the Apalachicola, aroused in the negroes and Indians a feeling of hostility to the Americans; and the mild treatment which they received from the Spaniards, tended to foster this feeling; so that the slaves were not a whit more in love with their Georgian masters, nor any the less inclined to run away from them; nor were the Indians any the less willing to receive them kindly in consequence of this fiendish slaughter. And the slaves of Georgia and Alabama still continued to run away from the Christian barbarism of those States, and to find an asylum in the humanity of the Seminole savages. This asylum our Government was determined to destroy. Accordingly, "the villages of these fugitives were burned, their plantations laid waste, their corn and other provisions used for the support of the army; and they, together with the Indians, dispersed into various parts of the Territory, to avoid the vengeance of the Americans." John Lee Williams, in his "Florida," published in 1837, though evidently disposed to conceal the worst part of the truth, says:—"Great exertions have been made to get the Indian negroes away by *force* and *fraud*."

"This was effected by a wanton invasion of a territory belonging to a friendly power. When that power refused to surrender her fortifications, on demand of our troops, our guns were turned upon them, and they were compelled to submit.

When our commanding officer was called to an account for these violations of faith, with a power at peace with us, he replied, that '*these fortifications had become the rendezvous for embodying hostile negroes and Indians, and giving them comfort and protection*,'"* and no further inquiries were made upon the subject."

* See General Jackson's Memorial to the Senate, Feb. 23, 1820.

But lest these continued acts of aggression should involve us in serious difficulties with Spain; and in order to obtain greater facilities for slave hunting, after protracted negotiations, Florida was purchased in 1819, at an expense to the people of five millions of dollars; and the territory was brought under "republican" government. The lands are comparatively worthless. General Jesup informed us, "*that they would not pay for the medicines used by our troops while removing the Indians;*" and the government of the territory has probably cost twenty times the amount of revenue received from it.* But then the nation got the hunting-ground, which was the sole object of the purchase; and after securing its title deed, and taking formal possession of the country, the next step was to break up the asylum of the fugitive slaves by exterminating the Seminoles. This scheme was at length accomplished by means of

The Second Seminole or "Florida War."

The reader will recollect, that by the treaty of "Payne's Landing," entered into in 1832, the Seminoles agreed to emigrate West, and re-unite with the Creeks; and that they refused to go lest their wives and children should be taken from them by the Creeks and held as slaves. The people of Florida, however, were anxious to rid their territory of them; and a large number of the principal inhabitants joined in a petition to the President for their removal, in which they declare, that

"While this indomitable people continue where they

* In 1839, Custom house officers at St. Augustine and St. Johns, were paid two thousand six hundred and fifty dollars, for collecting nothing.—J. R. GIDDINGS.

now are, the owners of slaves in our Territory, and even in the States contiguous, cannot for a moment, in any thing like security, enjoy this kind of property."

"The President referred the memorial to the Secretary of War, and he called upon the Agent of the United States, then with the Seminoles, for information. The Agent (General Wiley Thompson) replied, that 'the principal causes which operate to cherish this feeling hostile to emigration are, first, the fear that their reunion with the Creeks, which will subject them to the government and control of the Creek national council, will be a surrender of a large amount of negro property now held by these people, to the Creeks as an antagonist claimant;' and Gen. Thompson further adds: "This Creek claim to negroes now in possession of the Seminoles, which is supposed to be the first cause of hostility to the emigration of the latter tribe, grows out of the treaty of 1821, between the United States and the former."†—*Rights of the free States subverted.*

After receiving this important information, our army was ordered to that territory for the purpose of compelling the Indians to emigrate. On the 27th of Jan., 1835, Gen. Thompson called for more troops, and the war began. Hungry men-stealers snatched at their prey.

The Washington correspondent of the N. Y. Journal of Commerce, June 3, 1836, says:—

"It was stated on the floor of Congress and uncontradicted, that our Government recognized the claim of the slave-holders, and SENT AGENTS TO KIDNAP THE CHILDREN OF THE SEMINOLES."

They seized Ocoola the chief of the Seminoles, chained him to a log, tore his wife from him, and with four hundred and sixty others adjudged to be slaves by the staff officers, delivered her over to interminable bondage.‡ No marvel that an Indian chief, as he looked on his little

† See House Doc., No. 274, 1st Ses. 24th Congress. ‡ House Doc. 52, 3d Sess. 27th Con.

children and thought of their stolen mother, should vow vengeance on the robbers.

This slave-hunt, which has been dignified by the name of "war," was continued through a period of five years. It was protected on the one side by the desperation of fugitives, preferring death to slavery; and on the other by a determination to annihilate those who gave them shelter and protection. A Mobile paper of March 28th, 1838, says:—

"It is the power to entice away and instruct in bush-fighting so many of our slaves that we would wish to annihilate. These Seminoles cannot remain in the peninsula of Florida, without threatening the internal safety of the South."

Of its destruction to life, the Army and Navy Chronicle says:—

"Apprised as we have been of the deadly service in Florida in which our gallant army has been, since 1835, engaged, we were not a little SURPRISED to learn the great mortality among its officers and men."

We have no data from which we can estimate the number of lives sacrificed in that war; but it may be safely asserted, that the capture of each slave cost the lives of two white men, and at least eighty thousand dollars in cash. The whole expense of this war has been estimated at forty millions of dollars.

It must not be forgotten, "that blood-hounds were also purchased in Cuba, and brought into Florida, to act as auxiliaries to our army, and that blood-hounds, and soldiers, and officers, marched together under 'the star spangled banner,' in pursuit of the panting fugitives who had fled from southern oppression."*

The English nation has fixed an indelible stain on its

* House Doc, 125, 3d Session, 25th Congress.

character, by employing the Hessians to fight against the Colonies in the war of the Revolution. But here we see these same colonies, after becoming "free and independent States;"—and after exhausting their own ingenuity as well as their military prowess, in hunting down and catching fugitive slaves—forming an alliance with the dogs of Cuba; and actually running and fighting side by side with their blood-hound allies. After scouring her plains with armed men and blood-hounds, and either slaughtering or driving from her borders the last vestige of those unfortunate red men, in whose bosoms was left one single throb of pity for the panting fugitive—Florida—with her whips and chains and thumb screws—her yokes and gags and branding irons, and trained bull dogs, and hunters of men—her gory hammocks steaming in the sun—the bones of her murdered native children bleaching on their father's graves, or rotting amidst the blood and ashes of their conflagrated homes—with "hot haste"—after two hour's debate—has been admitted as a meet co-partner to this "great sisterhood of States!" She stands side by side in loving fellowship with Massachusetts; and Massachusetts does not blush at the relationship!

Treaties and Negotiations with England.

During our two wars with Great Britain, multitudes of slaves fled from their masters, and sought protection under the British flag. To enable the reader to judge of the number that escaped during the revolutionary war, we insert the following extract from Ramsay's History.

"When the British evacuated Charleston, S. C., in 1782, Governor Matthews demanded the restoration of *some thousands* of negroes who were within their lines.

*** These, however, were but a *small part* of the whole taken away at the evacuation, but that number is very inconsiderable when compared with the *thousands* that were lost from the first to the last of the war. It has been computed by good judges that between the years 1775 and 1783, the State of South Carolina lost TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND NEGROES." [At least a fifth part of all the slaves in the state at the beginning of the war. See page 30.]—*Ramsay's Hist. S. C. v. 1. p. 473-4.*

Col. Lee of Virginia, in his *Memoirs of the War in the Southern Department*, Vol. 2, p. 456, says

"It is asserted upon the authority of the best informed citizens of South Carolina, that *more than TWENTY THOUSAND* slaves were lost to the State in consequence of the war."

Extract of a letter from Mr. Jefferson, then Secretary of State, to Mr. Hammond, Minister of Great Britain, Dated, Philadelphia, Dec. 15, 1791.

"On withdrawing the troops from New-York, a *large embarkation* of negroes, the property of the inhabitants of the U. S. took place. *** A *very great number* was carried off in private vessels, without admitting the inspection of the American Commissioners."—See "Political Correspondence," Papers relative to Great Britain, p. 4.

Strange "*Liberty*" that, for which the Colonies were fighting! It had not half so many attractions to their SLAVES, as the "tyranny" against which they were contending.

"In the first article of the treaty of Ghent a stipulation was inserted for the restoration of slaves, understood by the commissioners who negotiated the treaty on the part of Great Britain to refer to those slaves who had been captured in certain forts; but by our Government understood to refer to all those slaves who had escaped from their masters during the war, and who had sought British protection. The construction given to the treaty by our

Executive was urged upon the British ministry with such persevering energy that a compromise was effected, by which they agreed to pay to the Government of the United States *one million two hundred and four thousand dollars*, for the benefit of those Southern planters who had lost their slaves.†

The Virginia and Maryland clamants under this treaty, set forth that,

“In July and August, 1814, the enemy made several landings on the northern neck of Virginia. On a sudden an order came, that all the troops should be marched to the defence of Washington, and this neck of eighteen miles wide, was emptied of all its efficient forces for nearly six weeks. During the absence of the forces there was nothing to *restrain* our slaves and *they flocked in hundreds to the enemy.*” See their memorial.—*St. Pap. 2 Sess. 20th Cong. v. 5, No. 190. p. 4.*

To enable the reader to form some estimate of the number of slaves who escaped from our Democratic liberty, and sought a refuge under Monarchal tyranny during the last war, we give the following extract from the report of the Committee of Ways and Means, to the House of Representatives, Jan. 5, 1819.

“At the conclusion of the war in 1815, it being known that **MANY THOUSANDS** of the slaves of our citizens had been carried off by the British ships of war,” &c.—*Am. St. Pap. F. Rel. v. 4. p. 114.*

Also the following extract of a letter from the Hon. John Quincy Adams to Lord Castlereagh, Feb. 12, 1816.

“In his letter of the 5th September, the undersigned had the honor of enclosing a list of 702 slaves carried away after the ratification of the treaty of peace from Cumberland Island, and the waters adjacent; * * * * * a number perhaps still greater was carried away from Tan-

† Laws U. S. Vol. 8, 693.

gier Island in the state of Virginia, and from other places. *Am. S. Pap. 2d Sess. 16th Cong. No. 82. p. 82.*

On the conclusion of peace in 1815, when the British Squadron embarked from the Cheseapeake to Burmuda, they took with them several slaves who had taken refuge on board their ships. Tracking the scent of a fugitive, with the keenness of its plantation dogs, our government followed in their wake. An agent was hurried off to Burmuda, to demand them of the governor. When the Agent — Thomas Spaulding, appeared before that dignitary, and presented his request, the reply of the Englishman was worthy of his country and his race :—" I would rather that Burmuda, with every man, woman and child in it, were sunk under the sea, than surrender up a single slave who had sought protection under the flag of England."

The agent then applied to Admiral Griffith, commanding on the Burmuda Station; and promised to furnish him with a list of each slave claimed, which he expected to receive in a few days from the United States. The Admiral told him, that he need not wait; as there was neither at Burmuda, nor any other British settlement, any authority "competent to deliver up persons, who, during the late wars, had placed themselves under the protection of the British flag."†

From Governors and Admirals, our government next applied to the British Cabinet. And for the space of twenty years, did the official slave-mongers of "this great Democratic confederacy," ply the British Government with its diplomacy, for the purpose of obtaining compensation for its runaway slaves. After referring the subject to Russia, at the request of the Americans; and holding convention after convention, for the adjustment of a question of such

† St. pap. 14th Cong. 2nd Sess, Senate, Dec. No. 82,

vital import to "our Republican liberties,"—the British Cabinet, wearied with the importunities of the American Government, and sick of the controversy, entered into a third convention on the 13th of November, 1836, by which the sum of *one million, two hundred and four thousand dollars* was paid over to the agents of this slave-holding Government.†

Everybody knows that great numbers of slaves have escaped from "our free institutions," and found an Asylum under the British Government, in Canada. On the 10th of May, 1828, the House of Representatives, by resolution "requested the President to open negotiations with the British Government, in the view to obtain an arrangement, whereby fugitive slaves, who have taken refuge in Canada, may be surrendered."‡

But the Executive had anticipated the wishes of the House; for as early as June 19, 1826, Henry Clay, who was then Secretary of State, wrote a letter of instructions to Mr. Gallatin, Minister to Great Britain, of which the following is an extract :—

"You are instructed to propose a stipulation for a mutual surrender of all persons held to service or labor under the laws of one party, who escape into the territories of the other. Our object in this stipulation is to provide for a *growing* evil. Persons of the above description escape principally from Virginia and Kentucky, into Upper Canada. In proportion as they are *successful* in their retreat to Canada, will the *number of fugitives increase*. The motive for getting them back is the desire which is generally felt to prevent the example of the fugitives becoming *contagious*."

"The States of Virginia and Kentucky are *particularly anxious* on this subject. The General Assembly of the latter has *repeatedly invoked* the interposition of the

† Jay's View, p. 25.

‡ See Journal of that date.

U. S. Government with Great Britain. You will therefore **PRESS** the matter.”†

This subject *was pressed* by our Minister, until he was distinctly told, “that such an arrangement on the part of Great Britain was impossible.” “*That the laws of Parliament gave freedom to every slave who should land on British ground.*”

Mr. Barbour to Mr. Clay. “I endeavored to impress on him, (the British Minister,) the importance of the subject—stating that the mischief was by no means confined to the number that escaped, but acted on, and much impaired the value of those who remained,—the successful attempts at elopement being a strong allurements **WITH ALL** to abscond.”

In 1843, several slaves escaped from Florida, and fled to the Island of New Providence. An agent was sent to that Island to demand them of the governor. An officer, and a detachment of the crew of one of our ships of war, together with the United States’ Revenue Cutter, *Nautilus*, were also employed in an unsuccessful attempt to catch these slaves, and drag them back to their republican chains and whipping posts.

“In 1831, ‘The Comet,’ a slave ship from Alexandria, for New Orleans, was wrecked on the Island of Abacco, and her slaves and crew were taken to Nassau, in the Island of New Providence. The island being under British laws, the slaves were of course free as soon as they landed on the British territory. They had been free under our laws, from the moment they were a league from our coast. Thus the reader will see that by the laws of both nations they were *freemen*. But the slave merchants, finding themselves unable to control the movements of their human cargo, called upon the authorities of the island for assistance, to aid them in holding their fellow men in subjection. But, there being no *law* there, by

† St. Pap. 2 Sess. 20. Cong. Vol. 1, No. 19.

which one foreigner could control the liberty of another, all aid was refused, and the slave-mongers returned to the United States, and claimed the assistance of the National Government to aid them in carrying out their attempted speculation in human flesh, by demanding of the British Government a compensation for their loss."

"In 1832, the brig 'Encomium,' from Charleston, for New Orleans, with slaves, was wrecked near Abacco, and her slaves obtained their liberty the same way."

"In 1835, 'The Enterprise,' another slave ship was driven into Bermuda, a British port, by stress of weather, and her slaves were also liberated by the force of British laws."

"These repeated losses alarmed the slave merchants, and threatened seriously to affect the prospects of those who were engaged in breeding slaves for market. The Executive entered upon the subject with great zeal and energy. Instructions were sent to our Minister at London, directing him to make demand of the British Government for reparation to the slave merchants who owned these cargoes of human beings. Not because the British Government or any subject of the British Crown had gained any thing in consequence of these persons having obtained their freedom; but because the slavedealers had sustained a loss, in consequence of the English Government not having enacted laws authorizing the American slave-trade. He was informed that this feature of the British laws *'was too dangerous to a large section of our country to be tolerated.'* The demand was made, and as our minister was himself an extensive slaveholder, he entered upon the subject with so much zeal, that his assertions were soon carried *far beyond the bounds of truth.* In an official communication to Lord Palmerston, he declared that our *'Government had more than once, in the most solemn manner, determined that slaves killed in the service of the United States, even in a state of war, were to be regarded as property, and not as persons, and the government held responsible for them.'* By means of the most unceasing energy, and misrepresentations on the part of our minister, the British Government were induced to pay over to our Executive the sum of £25,000 sterling, for the benefit of those who claimed to own persons on board "the Comet" and 'the Encomium.' These vessels were wrecked,

and the persons on board obtained their liberty prior to the taking effect of the general emancipation act, which liberated the slaves in the British West India Islands. But the 'Enterprise' had entered Bermuda after the taking effect of that law, and the British Ministers refused all compensation to the slave owners on board that ship. Partial success, however, stimulated the Executive to a more vigorous prosecution of the claims of the unfortunate slave-dealers who owned the cargo of 'the Enterprise.' Fresh instructions were sent to our minister at London; and to aid the Executive with the influence of the Senate, resolutions declaring the law of nations to authorize a slave ship when driven by stress of weather to enter the port of a friendly power, and to hold control of the slaves on board until she can refit, were introduced into the Senate by the Hon. J. C. Calhoun; and although their fallacy was apparent to every county court lawyer, yet they were adopted by the Senate without a dissenting voice. Most of the Senators from free States, however, refused to vote.* To aid the Executive still further, the committee on foreign affairs in the House of Representatives made a report, in which this subject was mentioned, and an allusion was made to the unpleasant consequences which would follow a final rejection of the demand by Great Britain.**†

While this was the state of diplomatic correspondence between the two governments, the 'Hermosa,' another slave ship, was wrecked, and her slaves obtained their freedom in the same manner as those on board the other ships. In October, 1842, soon after the wreck of the *Hermosa*, the *Creole* left Richmond, Va., for New Orleans, with slaves on board. While at sea, the slaves rose upon the crew, killed one of them, and took the ship to Nassau, and, leaving her to the control of her captain, they went on shore in pursuit of their own happiness. These circumstances appear to have aroused the whole slaveholding interest. Instructions were again transmitted to our minister at London, and he was exhorted to press the demand upon the British Government for compensation for the slaves on board those ships. The Senate called for the correspondence, discussion ensued, in which grave

* See Senate, Jour. 1st Sess. 26th Cong.

† See Jour. H. Rep 2nd Sess. 26th Cong.

Senators threatened destruction to those islands if compensation were not granted to the slave merchants who had thus lost their cargoes of slaves."—*Rights of Free States Subverted.*

Mr. King said, "If such outrages continue, nothing could prevent a collision; and unless the British Government should retrace her steps, war must inevitably ensue."

Mr. Calhoun, "hoped the citizens would know what protection this government could extend to their property: And if we cannot obtain justice, every man with an American heart in his bosom, will be ready to raise his hand against oppression."

Mr. Barrow said—that "if these contemptable British subjects at Nassau, are permitted to go on in this way, seizing by force of arms, and liberating slaves belonging to American citizens, the south would be compelled to fit out an armament and destroy those towns."

Such was the "outburst of indignant feeling," in the legislature of "*the first Nation on Earth*," when intelligence reached the Capitol, that a cargo of their slaves had obtained their freedom, by landing within the limits of the Monarchical government.

Attempt to obtain Fugitive Slaves from Mexico.

Encouraged by the success which have crowned its endeavors to induce the British Government to become the catchpolls to the slave-holders, this government, next tried to seduce the Mexicans from their allegiance to the principles of freedom, and to persuade them to act the part of watchdogs to the plantations of the South-Western Slave-holding States. Hardly had Mexico become a nation, when the subject was brought before the American Congress—that great palladium of

slavery. As an entering wedge, on the 18th of Dec 1826, Mr. Brent, of Louisiana, offered the following :—

“ *Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to inform this house whether any measures have been taken to obtain the runaway negro slaves from Louisiana and elsewhere, which have taken *refuge* in the territories of Mexico.”*

And accordingly a treaty was negotiated with the Mexican Minister for the surrender of such fugitive slaves as might seek a refuge on the soil of that Republic. But the treaty was rejected by the Mexican Congress, which denounced slavery as “ a palpable violation of the first principles of a free republic.”

Upon the subject of this refusal, Mr. Poinsett, our Minister to Mexico, made to his government the following commentary :—

“ The article for the restoration of fugitive slaves was rejected on philanthropic principles altogether. Such are most likely to influence the young legislators of young nations.”

The Nation which Mr. Poinsett had “ the honor to represent,” had got to be full fifty years old;—mangrown, for an individual, but for a nation, it was still in its swadling clothes. But though young in years, it was hoary in crime, and bloody with guilt. And this was doubtless the reason of its putting on such airs of superiority.

Southampton Insurrection.

In August, 1831, a few slaves in the upper part of Southampton county, Virginia, commenced an insurrection. Their whole numbers perhaps at no time exceeded one hundred. When the news reached Norfolk, the au-

* Jour. H. R. for 1826-7, p. 70.

thorities of that city made immediate application to Col. House, then commanding at Fortress Murre, who, at six o'clock the next morning, embarked on board a steamboat, with three companies of United States troops, for the scene of action. He was reinforced by a detachment from on board the United States ships Warren and Natchez, amounting in all to about three hundred men, who without any authority whatever, thus turned out to suppress the efforts of their fellow-men, who were exerting themselves to attain that liberty for which so much blood was shed during the war of our Revolution. Their efforts to regain the inalienable rights with which God had endowed them, were as legal, and far more just and holy, than those of Washington and his associates during the Revolution; inasmuch as they fought for natural rights, while our fathers contended for political privileges. Yet so eager were these officers of the United States army and navy to put down these attempts of their fellow-men to break the chains of oppression, that they waited for no orders or directions from proper authority, but, in violation of the Constitution, of law, and of justice, they sought to kill and to murder those who were seeking to obtain their freedom."†

We have already shown that the government of the "model republic," has been of great service to its leige lords, the slave-holders, in ferreting out and catching, and when unable to catch, in paying for such of their victims as were foolish enough to run away from "contentment and happiness."

Acts of Congress.

As early as 1790, Congress passed a naturalization law, prescribing the mode in which "any alien being a WHITE person" might be admitted to the rights of an American citizen.

In 1792, an act was passed for organizing the Militia, providing that "each and every *free* able bodied WHITE male citizen," &c.

†Nile's Register.

No other nation on earth prohibits any portion of its citizens from partaking in the national defence. But this nation enslaves its colored citizens,—sells them at auction, robs them of wives, children, homes; of every thing they hold dear :—scourges them till the earth is watered with their tears, and fattened with their blood : And it may be that the fire of *patriotism* burns too dimly on the ‘altar of their hearts,’ for them to fight very bravely in defence of such a country. But why prohibit those who might wish to fight, but for the purpose of creating a degraded distinction? •

The 4th section of the act of 1810, organizing the Post-Office department, provides that “no other than a free ~~white~~ person shall be employed in carrying the mail of the United States, either as a post rider, or a driver of any carriage carrying the Mail,” under a penalty of fifty dollars.†

While Florida was a Territory of the United States, the bills passed by its legislature were submitted to Congress. If approved by that body, they became laws; but not otherwise. Thus, Congress enacted, that if any person should aid any other person, held as a slave to escape from slavery, he should be punished by the pillory, branding, fine and imprisonment. In July 1844, Jonathan Walker, a citizen of Massachusetts, was seized on the high seas, between Florida and the Bahamas, charged with having violated this law,—carried in a United States’ steamer to Pensacola, tried before a United States’ Court, set in a United States’ pillory, branded with a United States’ branding iron, chained with a United States’ chain, to the naked floor of a wretched prison, without either bed, chair, or table; and after being confined in this horrid con-

† Jay’s View, p. 9.

dition more than eleven months, was released on condition of paying into the treasury of this liberty loving nation the sum of five hundred and ninety-six dollars.

Efforts to Prevent Emancipation in Cuba.

While Mexico and the South American Republics were struggling for their independence, they did not, like their more Northern neighbor, march to the battle field with the sword in one hand, while they flourished the slave driver's whip in the other. On the contrary, they began simultaneously with their efforts to obtain their own liberty, to extend its blessings to their bondmen : And when they had fairly achieved their independence, they gave freedom to every slave within their borders. At the time of the Congress of Panama, Spain was still striving to maintain her supremacy over these colonies. This Congress assembled in 1825; and the United States were invited to attend. And as "Cuba was at a short distance, devoted to the royal cause, and affording a depot for the royal forces ready to prey on their commerce, Mexico and Columbia proposed to invade this island with the view of throwing off the royal authority. But this government, true to those slave-holding instincts which had guided and controlled all its foreign relations, saw nothing but mischief in the proposed measure.

Mexico had commenced the work of abolition the year before. Columbia was doing the same. With these republics, the words of liberty were not mere "rhetorical flourishes : " They meant something, even to the poor bondmen. Yet they were signs of ill omen to the South, which this government could not help seeing. It saw, further, that the conquest of Cuba by these republics,

would result in the abolition of slavery in that island. And as the Nation had given its pledge to the slave-holding interest, and had always lived it out in the fulness of its spirit, the idea of emancipation in Cuba was not to be tolerated.

Accordingly, our representatives to the Congress of Panama, Messrs. Anderson and Sargeant, were instructed by Henry Clay, who was then Secretary of State, to use their utmost endeavors to dissuade Mexico and Columbia from the proposed invasion. In his letter of instructions of May 8th, 1826, he says :—

“It is required by the frank and friendly relations which we most anxiously desire ever to cherish with the new republics, that you should, without reserve, explicitly state that the United States have too much at stake in the fortunes of Cuba, to allow them to see with indifference a war of invasion prosecuted in a desolating manner; or to see employed in the purposes of such a war, one race of the inhabitants combatting against another.—The Humanity of the United States in respect to the weaker, and which in such a terrible struggle would probably be the suffering portion, and the duty to defend themselves against the *contagion* of such near and dangerous examples, would constrain them, even at the hazard of losing the friendship of Mexico and Columbia to employ all means necessary to their security.”

In case Mexico and Columbia should send an army of deliverance to Cuba, for the purpose of “loosing the bands of wickedness,” and giving freedom to the thousands of her sighing captives, thus ridding that island of a most heaven-daring system of oppression,—“*the humanity of the United States,*” would prompt them to send over an army of the “sons of liberty,” to fight in behalf of these Spanish slave-holders. How strangely are men drawn together by the affinities of a common interest. Pilate and

Herod could be "made friends," when there was a "just man" to crucify.

Our Minister at St. Petersburg was instructed "to endeavor to engage the Russian Government to contribute its best exertions towards terminating the existing contest between Spain and her colonies. From the vicinity of Cuba to the United States, and *the nature of its population*, their government cannot be indifferent to any political change, to which that island may be destined."†

Spain was also begged and entreated to put a stop to the war, lest it might result in the abolition of slavery in Cuba, and so shake the system so fondly cherished by the "democracy" in the United States.

Mr. Clay, in his letter to Mr. Everett of April 27th, 1825, says:—"It is not for the new republics, that the President wishes you to urge upon Spain the expediency of concluding the war. The possible contingencies of a protracted war, *might* bring upon the Government of the United States duties and obligations, the performance of which, however painful it should be, they might not feel at liberty to decline."‡

Some extracts from the debates in Congress on the Panama Mission will further illustrate the solicitude of the Americans for the safety of their "peculiar institution."

Mr. Randolph of Virginia, said:—"Cuba possesses an immense negro population. In case Mexico and Columbia should invade Cuba at all, it is unquestionable that this invasion will be made with this principle—*this genius of universal emancipation*—this sweeping anathema against the white population in front, and then, sir, *what is the situation of the Southern States?*"

Mr. Johnson, of Louisiana, said:—"We know that Mexico and Columbia have long contemplated the independence of Cuba. What then, at such a crisis, becomes the

† Letters from Mr. Clay, to Mr. Middleton, 10th May, 1825.

‡ Senate, Dec. 1st Sess. 19th Cong. Vol. 3.

duty of this government? Send your Ministers instantly to this assembly where the measure is maturing. *Advise*, with them, *remonstrate*—*MENACE*, if necessary, against a step so dangerous to us."

Mr. Berrien, of Georgia, said :—" With a due regard to the safety of the Southern States, can you suffer these islands to pass into the hands *BUCANIERS*, *drunk with their new born liberty*? If our interests and our safety shall require us to say to these new republics, Cuba and Porto-Rico, must remain as they are, we are free to say it. And by the blessing of God (!) and the strength of our arms, to enforce the declaration; and let me say to gentlemen, that these high considerations do require it,—*the vital interest of the South requires it.*"†

In what respect did the United States *differ* from " these new republics," which this sturdy democrat here stigmatized as " *Bucaniers*?" Certainly there is a broad difference,—The United States—whether bucaniers or not—never got so " *drunk with their new born liberty*," as to demolish their human flesh shambles, in the boisterous merriment of their intoxication. They are always *sober* enough to keep the watch-dogs of their plantations well trained;—their whips, and gags, and thumbscrews—their iron collars and chains, and bowie-knives and branding irons, ready for use. They never for a moment forget these; Not even in the very midst of their great national revels, in honor of " *freedom and the rights of man.*"

Whether Mexico and Columbia were influenced by the threats and " *menaces*," of the United States or not, they gave up the talk of invasion; but the war still continued, and with it, the fears of the Americans. They were alarmed lest some change in its fortunes might yet give freedom to the slaves in Cuba. And Spain was again urged to cease this warfare, so hazardous to " *the vital interests of*

† Cong. Debates, Vol. 2.

the South." On the 22nd of October, 1829, Mr. Van Buren, then Secretary of State, wrote a letter of instructions to Mr. Van Ness, Minister to Spain, in which he says :—
" Considerations connected with a certain class of our populations, make it the interest of the Southern section of the Union, that no attempt should be made in that island to throw off the yoke of Spanish dependence; the first effect of which would be the sudden emancipation of a numerous slave population, whose result could not but be sensibly felt on the adjacent shores of the United States."

Relations to Hayti.

The existence of this republic is almost co-eval with our own. Its government, as an independent nation, was organized on the 1st of July, 1798. And as there are many gross mis-conceptions in the public mind relative to the causes of the revolution in the Island of St. Domingo, it may be well to take a hasty glance at its history.

In 1790, the free colored population was somewhat greater than that of the whites. Though many of this class were wealthy and educated, they were debarred from all political privileges on account of their complexion. The island was at this time a colony of France. The entire population was estimated at 686,000. Six hundred thousand of whom were slaves, forty four thousand free people of color, and the remainder whites.

At the commencement of the French revolution, the National Assembly abolished all distinctions on account of color, and gave the free blacks in the colonies the same civil rights that were enjoyed by their white brethren. The latter refused to submit to this decree, and a civil war

between the whites and free blacks ensued, in which the slaves took no part. In 1792, the French government sent over three commissioners with 6,000 troops, to enforce their decree, and to restore order. "Many of the planters still resisted, while others took sides with the Government, and the distractions of the island were now aggravated by a civil war between the *whites themselves*."

A portion of the planters now intrigued with Great Britain to seize the island, and thus save them from the consequences of republican principles. In compliance with their invitation through their agent, Mr. Charmilly, an expedition was fitted out at Jamaica for this purpose; and on the 19th of September, 1793, it arrived at Jeremie. One of the French commissioners, who at the time happened to be acting alone, receiving intelligence of the intended invasion, issued a hasty proclamation, giving freedom to all the slaves, as the only means of preserving the colony from conquest.

"The free negroes and emancipated slaves united in defending the island from the invaders, while an army of two thousand whites ranged themselves under the British standard." The French commissioners soon after returned home, and great numbers of the planters emigrated and virtually abandoned the island. The British troops were re-inforced from time to time; but the blacks under Toussaint L'Overture, who was appointed "Governor General of the armies of St. Domingo," continued the contest for about five years, and succeeded in driving the English from the island, and thoroughly establishing its independence under the name of "the republic of *HAÏTI*."

The next attempt to subjugate the island was made by Bonaparte. "Early in January, 1802, a French army of 20,000 men were landed at St. Domingo, and various reinforcements afterwards followed." "The war was

waged with atrocious cruelty on the part of the French; and the blacks, aided by the climate succeeded in destroying about forty thousand of their enemies in about eleven months; and on the 19th of November, 1802, the wrecks of the invading army surrendered to Dessalines the black chief."†

"In 1805, Dessalines was appointed governor for life, and soon after assumed the title of Emperor. He was slain by a military conspiracy in 1806, and was succeeded by Christophe as Chief Magistrate for life; Pétion, a mulatto, being a rival candidate, and defeated in a severe battle in 1807. In 1811, he assumed the title of King, and was massacred in a military conspiracy in 1820. But during the whole period from 1801 to 1818, Pétion was President of the mulatto population, in the south and west part of the island. He died in 1818, greatly lamented, for he was a good and able ruler, and was succeeded by Boyer, who on the death of Christophe, in 1820, became President of the whole of the French part of the island. The Spanish part was ceded to France in 1794, but was held by the Spanish population till 1821, when they offered to join the republic of Columbia, but were rejected. They have remained independent ever since, though in number, probably not exceeding 100,000. The Presidency of Boyer continued till his expulsion a few months ago."

"Here, then, is a history of the colored population of Hayti for forty years. In that period, they have exhibited one civil war between the blacks and mulattoes; two dethronements of monarchs, and one expulsion of a President, and three changes of government; two from republicanism to monarchy, and one from monarchy to republicanism. This looks like a formidable catalogue of discords. But how does it compare with the catalogue of France? During this period we have seen France pass from a republic under a *directory*, to a republic under a Consul for years; then to a Consulship for life; then to the rule of an Emperor; then to that of a Constitutional King; then to that of Emperor; then to that of another Constitutional

† Jay's view.

King striving to overthrow the constitution; then to that of a 'Citizen King,' surrounded by republican institutions. During the same period, France has exhibited the civil war of La Vendee, two dethronements of Kings, two of Emperors, two invasions of the 'allies;' and Paris, 'which is France,' has exhibited the massacre of the 'sections,' and the 'memorable three days;' and we may add to the catalogue not *less* than six constitutions. And though no King or Emperor has been assassinated in this period, the attempts to assassinate Napoleon were 'legion,' and those to kill the present King have been more than we can count, and are probably not ended. Now if all the disorders of Hayti prove the incapacity of its people for self governments, what story do those of France tell for French men?" Especially when we reflect that many of the disorders of Hayti grew out of those of France.

"Shall we go to Mexico and South America for comparisons in capacity for self government? Let the innumerable contests among generals, and the horrible oppressions which they have inflicted upon the people answer the questions. Shall we go to Spain and Portugal? In each, the *revolutions* have been like the changes of the season, and are still in *progress*, and we may challenge the bloodiest details of Haytien history for parallels to the atrocities of Spain. If Dessalines and Christophe were cruel tyrants, as they were, what shall we say of such monsters as Miguel and Ferdinand VII? If the late anarchy of Hayti was deplorable, what is that of Spain? Well may those who deny the capacity of the Haytiens for self government, say that comparisons are 'odious.'"

But we are told that the Haytiens are rude and uncultivated barbarians, and therefore unfit to be acknowledged as the rightful governors of so fair a country.

To this, it may be answered, that there is no surer index to the civilization of any nation, than its laws and institutions. By a brief reference to the provisions of the constitution of Hayti, we shall see at a glance that such charges

are the vilest slander. That instrument is prefaced by the following preamble :—

“The people of Hayti proclaim, in the presence of the Supreme Being, the present Constitution, that they may consecrate forever, its rights, its civil and political guaranties, and its national independence.”

“Every citizen, over twenty-one years of age, exercises political rights.”

“Haytiens are equal in the eye of the law, and are equally admissable to all civil and military employments, and there is no distinction of orders.”

“The right of property is inviolable.”

“The freedom of speech and of the press are recognized. And all forms of religion are equally tolerated.”

“Schools are established, and the mode of teaching untrammelled.”

“The trial by jury is established in all criminal matters.”

“The right of the people, peaceably to assemble and discuss political subjects—also the right of petition, recognized.”

The privileges and authority of the National Assembly, are the same as the American Congress. Their form of government is essentially like our own.

Such are some of the provisions of the fundamental law of the Republic of Hayti. Now compare them with the laws of more than half the States of this Union, which convert nearly one half of their entire population into goods and chattels; and which expose them for sale at public auction like horses and swine in the market; and then say who are the greatest Barbarians, the Haytiens or the Americans?

As an additional evidence of the civilization of Hayti, we insert the following from *Brooks' Universal Gazetteer*—*Art.—St. Domingo*:—

"A college has been founded and liberally endowed at Cape Haytien, in which provision is made for instruction in all the languages, arts and sciences, usually taught in European establishments of the like kind; public schools have been established in most of the principal towns of the west part of the Island; and be the future destiny of St. Domingo what it may, she is at present one of the most interesting subjects for contemplation in the world; an age has hardly passed away since the bulk of the inhabitants were held in the most abject and degraded state of bondage; since when, they have successfully resisted the arms of two of the most powerful nations of their time, and now remain pursuing a silent but steady course towards giving a new and additionally important character to the social relations of the civilized world."

"For those who question the industry of the Haytiens, we subjoin the following tables, showing the exports from the Island of late years. No better proof can be given of the *general industry* of a people, than the amount of their productions; and the records of the custom house is one of the readiest evidences of this; though of course but an approach to a just estimate. It enables us, however, to compare one nation with another." It will be remembered that the population of the Island is estimated at 800,000 or 900,000. Not much greater than that of the State of Massachusetts.

From Essays on Colonies, &c., by Judge Jerimie.

EXPORTS IN 1832, FROM HAYTI.

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Coffee. | 50,000,000 lbs., | valued at \$4,400,000. |
| Cotton. | 1,500,000 " | |
| Tobacco. | 500,000 " | |
| Cocoa. | 500,000 " | |
| Dye-Wood. | 5000,000 " | |
| Tortoise Shell. | 12,000 " | |
| Mahogany. | 6000,000 feet. | |
| Hides. | 80,000 lbs. | |

From the American Almanac.

| Imports to the U. S. from Hayti. | Exports from U. S. to Hayti. | Exports from England to Hayti. | France in 1833, exported to Hayti |
|---|---|---|---|
| Average annual imports for thir- teen years, ending 1841, \$1,702,106. | Average annual exports for thir- teen years, ending 1841, \$1,225,700. | Average annual exports from 1830, to 1835, \$1,759,216. | \$701,729. Same year, her imports from Hayti, a- mounted to \$905- 432.** |

This shows a balance of trade against the United States, and in favor of Hayti, of \$476,406 per annum. Also a ballance of more than \$200,000 against France, and in favor of Hayti. The average amount of income to the government for seven years, ending in 1825, was \$2,687,358; and the average expenditure for the same time was \$2,526,741, showing an average annual excess of income over the expenditures of \$160,617.

"A government, we need hardly remark, must be efficient, which for a series of years exhibits an almost uninterrupted excess of income over expenditure—the revenue being entirely created by trade."†

So much for the indolence and poverty of the Haytiens. Their annual exports, according to population, are about equal to those of the United States.

And now let us inquire what has been the conduct of the United States towards this heroic republic, which had thus manfully and successfully struggled for its independence.

They have ever refused to acknowledge their independence, or to enter into any civil or diplomatic relations with them whatever. This nation professes to glory in the doctrine that "all men are created equal, and have an inalienable right to liberty," and it should not ohly have been first and foremost, to acknowledge the independence of the Haytiens, but the first generously to step forward and aid them

* Light and Truth, p. 395.

† Emancipator, July 12, 1839.

in obtaining it. Instead of this, what do we see? Instigated by the emissaries of Bonaparte, who was exasperated at the loss of his army, and his inability to subjugate the island, as well as their own hatred of the colored race, Congress passed an act on the 28th of February, 1806, "to suspend the commercial intercourse between the United States and certain parts of the island of St. Domingo."*

The law provided that any vessel trading from any part of the United States to any of the prohibited parts of St. Domingo, together with the cargo of such vessel, should be forfeited, &c. This act was never repealed, but expired by its own limitation.

One of the subjects of consideration at the Congress of Panama, which has already been mentioned—was the recognition of the independence of Hayti. We here give some extracts from speeches in Congress, while the subject of the Panama Mission was under discussion there.

MR. BERRIEN, of Georgia:—"Consistently with our own safety, can the people of the South *permit* the intercourse which would result from the establishing relations of any sort with Hayti? Is the emancipated slave to be admitted into their ports, to spread the doctrines of insurrection, and to strengthen and invigorate them, by exhibiting in his own person an example of successful revolt?"

MR. BENTON of Missouri:—"The peace of eleven States of this Union will not permit the fruits of a successful negro insurrection to be seen among them;—it will not permit the fact to be seen and told, that they are to find friends among the white people of the United States."

MR. HAMILTON of South Carolina:—"It is proper that on this occasion I should speak with candor and without reserve: that I should avow what I believe to be the sentiments of the Southern people on this question, and this is, that *Haytian independence is not to be tolerated in any form.*"

* Laws of the U. S. Vol. I, p. 4.

MR. HAYNE of South Carolina:—"With nothing connected with slavery can we consent to treat with other nations; and least of all ought we to touch the question of the independence of Hayti in conjunction with the revolutionary governments whose own *history* affords an example scarcely less fatal to *our* repose. These governments have proclaimed principles of liberty and equality; and have marched to victory under the banner of universal emancipation. You find men of *color* at the head of their armies, in the legislative halls, and in the executive departments. Our policy with regard to Hayti is plain: We NEVER can acknowledge her independence. Let our government direct all our Ministers in South America and Mexico, to PROTEST against the independence of Hayti."

MR JOHNSON of Louisiana:—"It may be proper to express to the South American States, the unalterable opinion entertained here, in regard to intercourse with them. The unadvised recognition of that Island, (Hayti) and the public reception of their Ministers, will nearly sever our diplomatic intercourse, and bring about a separation and alienation injurious to both. I deem it of the highest concern to the political connection of these countries, to *remonstrate* against a measure so justly offensive to us, and to make that remonstrance EFFECTUAL.†

Twelve years after, on the 17th of December, 1838, a petition was presented to Congress, praying for the establishment of the usual international relations with Hayti. As soon as the objects of the petition were known, a storm was raised on the question of its reception; and no less than thirty two members voted against it. A few extracts from the speeches on that occasion, will show that time had nothing abated the bitterness of feeling on the part of the white skinned "democracy," towards their Haytien neighbors.

The Chairman of the committee of Foreign Relations, to which the memorial was finally referred, said, "that simi-

† Cong. Debates, Vol. 2.

lar petitions had been sent there the last session, which had never been reported on. This would take a similar course ; *it would never be heard of again.*"

MR. LEGARE of South Carolina :—" As sure as you live, sir, if this cause is permitted to go on, the sun of this Union will go down—it will go down in BLOOD—and go down to rise no more. I will vote unhesitatingly against nefarious designs like these. They are treason—yes sir, I pronounce the authors of such things traitors—traitors, not to their country only, but to the *whole human race.*"

This refined gentleman either meant to except the Haytiens, or to say that they were no part of the human race.

MR. WISE of Virginia :—" We are called upon to recognize the insurrectionists who rose on their French masters. A large number of those now in power in this black republic, are slaves who cut their master's throats. And will any gentleman tell me now, that slaves, aided by an English army, ought to be recognized by this Government? Never will I—never will my constituents be forced into this. This is the only body of men who have emancipated themselves by butchering their masters. They have long been free, I admit ; yet if they had been free for *centuries*,—if time himself should confront me, and shake his hoary locks at my opposition, I should say to him, I owe more to my constituents—to the quiet of my people—than I owe, or can owe to mouldy prescriptions, however ancient."

This Virginian for once has been *wise* above what is written. The " English army " of which he speaks went to St. Domingo, not for the purpose of aiding the slaves in obtaining their freedom, but to assist the masters in reducing them to slavery, after they had been emancipated ; with what success has already been shown. He seems also to have forgotten, that Washington, and Hancock, and Warren, and Jefferson, and Franklin, and Henry, and probably his own grandfather—if not a tory—had but a

little while before, risen on their English "masters," and "cut their throats;" and obtained their freedom by "butchering" them, in the same way the Haytiens had done. But then, these latter bear a different complexion from the former, which makes all the difference in the world.

"In 1842, the imports from Hayti into the United States exceeded in value the imports from Prussia, Sweden and Norway, Denmark and the Danish West Indies, Ireland and Scotland, Holland, Belgium, Dutch West Indies, British West Indies, Spain, Portugal, and all Italy, Turkey, and the Levant, or any one of the South American republics."*

Although this government has been willing to run—to "pull foot" after fugitive slaves, to the remotest corners of the continent, and even across the ocean, it affords no protection to this commerce. It "minds its own business"—that of slave-hunting.

"Our trade with Hayti is embarrassed; it is subjected to severe discriminating duties. We are probably the least favored of any people in the ports of that Republic. Tonnage duties and vexatious port charges, discourage and oppress our commerce there. The acknowledged cause of all the embarrassments to that trade, is found in the fact that our government refuses to acknowledge the government of Hayti. While all other powers have acknowledged them as an independent sovereignty, we stand aloof as if they were a lawless tribe of savages. We have no representative at the island of any grade; nor have they a public officer accredited here. No commercial relation, therefore, exists between the two governments."†

And Northern men are willing thus to sacrifice their immense trade with Hayti, rather than incur the displeasure of the slave power, by pressing up Congress to acknowledge its independence.

* Jay's View. † Speech of Mr. Grennell, H. R., Dec. 18, 1838

PART II.

Texas and the Mexican War.

“ Our Union is a confederation of independent States, *whose policy is peace with each other and all the world.* To enlarge its limits is TO EXTEND THE DOMINION OF PEACE over additional territories and increasing millions.”—Polk’s Inagural Message.

We come now to consider the most infamous transactions which blacken the records of national crime. The colonization of Texas by citizens of the United States—the revolution in that State—the hurried acknowledgement of its independence by this government—its annexation to this Union,—and the war with Mexico, are all connecting links in a chain of events; having for their sole object, the indefinite extension and perpetuation of slavery, and the continued supremacy of the slave power over this nation. There has been for many years a growing disquietude among the people of the South in regard to the prospects of their “peculiar institution” amounting to a gloomy apprehension. They were fearful that with the disappearance of slavery at the North, and the admission of new free States, would return strong feelings of dislike and even hostility to their most cherished system; and they set themselves zealously to the work of devising plans for its future safety.

The American revolution, gave a momentary impulse to the principles of universal freedom, and led the people of the Northern States to look with a favorable eye towards the emancipation of their slaves. And as early as the first of March, 1780, the General Assembly of Pennsylvania passed "an act for the gradual abolition of slavery" in that State. The abolition of slavery in Massachusetts takes its date *one day later* than that of Pennsylvania; with this difference, that in Massachusetts the abolition was immediate, instead of gradual: it being effected by the adoption of its constitution and "Bill of Rights" declaring that "all men were born free and equal." The act of Pennsylvania was followed by similar ones, in Connecticut in 1784; in Rhode Island of the same date; in all the States North-west of the Ohio river, by the ordinance of 1787; in New Hampshire in 1792; in New-York in 1799; and in New Jersey in 1804. So that the fears of the South, for the safety of the "patriarchal institution" may *appear* to have been well grounded.

In none of the States just mentioned, was slavery ever regarded as a "great interest;" and therefore they could well afford to dispense with it. But in giving up that which was of little value to themselves, they by no means made war upon the system, as existing in the States of the South. It is true that some of the "fathers of the revolution," both spoke and wrote against slavery, as unjust and cruel; and petitioned Congress to take measures for its abolition. But the spirit of liberty which animated their bosoms departed with them; and its place was occupied in the bosoms of their sons by the *spirit of trade*. So that what the fathers regarded according, to the laws of God, as a *crime* to be repented of and forsaken, was regarded by their sons, according to the laws of *trade*, as a fit subject for their *ledgers*: And as the slave trade from WASH-

INGTON, and Baltimore, and Norfolk, to New Orleans and Mobile, soon became, in consequence of prohibiting the foreign slave trade, a profitable business to Northern ship owners, they resolutely stand by the "compromises of the constitution;" and give to slavery its utmost scope and limit; so that the fears of the Southern slave-mongers, after all, were not so well grounded as they at first imagined. They had many sworn friends among their "Northern brethren" yet.

In addition, however, to their *well grounded* fears, there has been from the beginning, among the people of the South, a growing jealousy of the increasing population, wealth, and influence of the North; and a determination to one day wield the power by right of majority in the National Councils, which they have hitherto wielded by bullying and threats. To accomplish this object, it would be necessary to acquire, honestly if they could, but dishonestly if they must,—a large amount of territory from some neighboring power, to be carved up into slaveholding states, and admitted to the Union on the most favorable terms. In casting about for the discovery of some territory suitable for this purpose, their longing eyes naturally fell on Texas, the most easterly province of Mexico. And accordingly a claim was set up to this territory, as "forming a part of the ancient province of Louisiana, which was ceded to the United States by France in 1803." And although Thomas Jefferson was one of the prime movers in the scheme of acquiring Texas, he admitted that this claim was without any foundation. For in a secret message sent to the House of Representatives on the 6th of December, 1805, he used the following language:—

"Our line to the West is one which would give us but a *string* of land on the Mississippi."

By the "line," here spoken of, was meant the western boundary of Louisiana, which was not at that time definitely settled; but lay somewhere between the Mississippi and Sabine rivers. Yet this claim was still pressed by Southern slave-holders, and their Northern abettors; who declared that Louisiana extended to the South-west as far as the Rio Del Norte, and was bounded on the West by that river. But what was the ground of this claim?

"Why it was, that La Salle having discovered the mouth of the Mississippi, and France having made a settlement at New Orleans, France had a right to one half the seacoast from the mouth of the Mississippi to the next Spanish settlement, which was Vera Cruz. The mouth of the Rio Bravo was about half way from the Balize to Vera Cruz; and so as grantees from France, of Louisiana, we claimed the Rio Del Norte, though the Spanish settlement of Santa Fe was at the head of that river. France, from whom we received Louisiana, utterly disclaimed ever having even raised such a pretension."†

Nor was any portion of this territory occupied by the United States. A correspondent of the New York Commercial Advertiser, writing from Nacogdoches, Texas, September 14, 1836, says:—

"For a long time after the acquisition of Louisiana, the United States exercised jurisdiction only to the Rio Hondo, but six miles west of Natchitoches, the immediate territory between this point and the Sabine River, about twenty miles, being considered neutral territory."

Yet so strong was the desire of the slave-holders, and so fixed their determination to obtain possession of that country, that

"No less than eight military expeditions were set on foot in the U. States, and prosecuted more or less to make a lodgment, and effect revolution and conquest in Texas. The

† Speech of J. Q. Adams, H. R. May 25, 1835.

first was Burr's, in which Andrew Jackson was a confederate."[†]

"By the Florida treaty, which was made in 1819, Spain released her claim to the disputed territory" lying to the east of the Sabine, apparently without any consideration except that of obtaining a quiet and acknowledged boundary;—a fatal mistake for concessions so made never fail to whet the appetite for plunder,"—and that river was formally agreed upon as the boundary between the Spanish possessions on the west, and the State of Louisiana on the east.

Hardly was the treaty ratified, establishing the Sabine as the western boundary of Louisiana, when the South began to complain of the "surrender" of territory; and plans were set on foot for the "*retrocession*" of Texas to the United States.

In 1820, Moses Austin, of Missouri, obtained a large grant of land in Texas, under the following circumstances.

"Austin proceeded to Mexico and from thence addressed a humble petition to the Catholic King, setting forth the cruel persecutions which Catholics were undergoing from the Protestant malignants of the United States. The philanthropic petitioner invoked the piety and charity of his Catholic majesty to grant a goodly tract of land in Texas as an asylum for persecuted saints. The King granted the prayer of the petitioner, on condition that none but Catholics should enjoy the benefit of the donation.

The land was granted gratuitously, to be parcelled out in like manner, and in certain proportions, among the refugees. The *empresario* (the one undertaking the *enterprise*) was to be entitled, upon the settlement of three hundred families, to a very large tract within the same grant, in his own right. The colonists were required to take the oath of allegiance, a test oath of their Catholicism, and to produce evidence of good moral character. Upon obtaining their allotments of land, and residing thereon six

† D. L. Child in the A. S. Standard, Oct. 3, 1846.

months, they were to be deemed naturalized subjects. They were exempted from taxes for ten years, and from duties on all imports for their own use during the same period.”*

“After obtaining his grant or privilege, he returned to Missouri, and proceeded to carry his colonial enterprise into effect. Before completing his arrangements, however, Moses Austin suddenly died,—and his son, Stephen F. Austin, took the business into his hands as the legal heir and representative of his father. He soon repaired to Texas with a considerable number of settlers, the most of whom emigrated from the States of Tennessee, Missouri, and Louisiana. But prior to his obtaining legal possession or effecting the settlement of the families who accompanied him—the revolution occurred, which annulled the authority of the government, and resulted in the separation of the Mexican provinces from the Spanish Crown.”†

“After the Revolution and the establishment of Mexican independence, this grant was confirmed by the Congress of that country, viz: in 1823—the moral qualifications of the colonists, the oath of allegiance and test oath, with needful changes of form in the two last, remaining the same.‡ The liberal terms granted to colonists, exempting them from taxation and import duties for ten years—opened to them a wide field for smuggling and speculation with the Indian traders, as well as the native inhabitants, which they did not fail to improve. ‘And many foreigners took lands, professedly with a view of settlements, and engaged extensively in this illicit traffic. Contraband articles—such as arms, ammunition, &c., for the savage tribes—were also introduced in great quantities whenever the vigilance of the government revenue officers could be eluded. Slaves were likewise held, in violation of the constitution and laws of the State and the decrees of the general government.”§

In this state of things, overtures were made to the government of Mexico, by the government of the United States,

* D. L. Child, in A. S. Standard, Oct. 8, 1846. † War in Texas.

‡ D. L. Child, in A. S. Standard, Oct. 8, 1846. § War in Texas.

for the purchase of Texas for the purpose of annexing it to this Union. Until the year 1824, slavery existed without any restrictions throughout the Mexican States. In that year measures were taken for its gradual abolition; and in 1829, by a decree of President Guerrero; in accordance with an act of the Mexican Congress, slavery was abolished throughout Mexico.

"In March, 1825, a few days after the accession of Mr. Adams to the presidency, *Henry Clay*, Secretary of State, instructed *J. R. Poinsett*, of South Carolina, our Minister to Mexico, to sound that Government on 'the fixation of a boundary further west than the Sabine,' directing him to suggest 'the river Brazos, or the Colorado, or the Snow-Mountains, or the Rio del Norte, in lieu of the Sabine.'" These instructions were renewed by Clay, in March, 1827, with considerable urgency, and with the additional instruction to offer one million of dollars for the entire country as far as the Rio Grande and the Rio Puereo, generously proposing to leave Santa Fe within the limits of Mexico. Soon after Jackson's accession, in August, 1829, Van Buren, his Secretary of State, again instructed Poinsett, 'to open a negotiation forthwith' for the purchase of the Mexican territory as far as the great desert, between the *Nueces* and the Rio Grande."

"The bid was now increased to *four millions*; and 'so strong,' adds the Secretary, 'is the President's conviction of the great value of the acquisition, that he will not object to go as high as *five millions*.'† In this letter, for the first time since the conclusion of the Florida treaty, a pretence of a *right* to a boundary further west, was brought forward. Van Buren states that it has been represented that the river called the Sabine is not the Sabine, but that the *Neckes* is the real Sabine! The explanation of this new pretension is, that the Neckes is from twenty to one hundred miles further *west* than the Sabine."

All these overtures were promptly rejected by the Mexican

* See instructions of Van Buren, Sec. of State, to *J. R. Poinsett*, Minister to Mexico, August 25, 1829.

Government, as they had neither the power nor the inclination to alienate any of their territory. Yet, as we have already shown, they evinced the greatest liberality to foreigners in granting them liberty to colonize their vacant lands. And as Texas had so long been a kind of "Naboth's vineyard" to the slave-holders, who had determined, Ahab like, to take possession of it, either by hook or by crook, immense tracts of land were designated for colonization, and contracted for by different "empresarios;" partly for fraudulent gain, but mainly for the purpose of obtaining by settlement and revolution what the government could not obtain by negotiation. Several "land companies," were also formed in different parts of the United States, to aid in playing this deep game with the more certainty of success.

"These companies created 'stocks' upon the basis of these grants and threw them into the market. They also issued 'scrip,' authorizing the holders of it to take possession of certain tracts of land, within the lines marked out on the map, as the boundaries of their respective grants. To a bona fide settler, (and none else could obtain the land it pretended to convey,) this scrip could be of no advantage whatever, as the facilities and expense of procuring his tract according to law, would be the same, whether he held it or not. Every cent paid for it, therefore, was so much loss to the settler, and gain to the company."

"Although these companies could only hold their grants through the medium of the empresarios, for the limited period of six years, and on the express condition of settling a specific number of families, they dealt largely in their 'stock,' and sold immense quantities of their 'scrip,' so that large sums of money have no doubt been realized by them—while very few settlers have been introduced. Thousands in various parts of the United State, purchased the scrip issued by them, and are interested of course in the adoption of measures to legalize the claims."*

* War in Texas, by Benjamin Lundy, p. 22, published in 1836.

But this could not be done while Texas remained, as a part of Mexico, and the colonization laws under which these privileges were obtained, remained in peace. So that vast number of these land jobbers, who had purchased those worthless titles to lands in Texas, had in common with the slave-holders a deep interest at stake in the game of annexation. And the government found in them a strong corps of active allies, ever ready to second, or to devise any plan which seemed most likely to accomplish a measure of such "vital interest" to them.

While these diplomatic and speculating chicaneries were in progress, Thomas H. Benton was plying the human flesh-mongers with a series of essays in the *St Louis Beacon*, over the signature of "Americanus," on the importance to the South of the "retrocession" of Texas.

On the subject of the essays, the *Edge-field Carolinian* remarks:—

"This large fragment of the Mississippi valley, *affording sufficient territory for four or five slave-holding States*, was unceremoniously sacrificed to Spain, with scarcely a pretext of demand. 'Americanus' exposes the evils to the United States of this surrender, under twelve different heads. Two of them of particular interest to this section of the country, are, that *it brings a non-slave-holding empire in juxtaposition with the slave-holding South-west*; and diminishes the outlet for the Indians inhabiting the States of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee."

A Charleston paper, also then observed:—"It is not improbable that he [President Jackson] is now examining the propriety and practicability of a retrocession of the vast territory of Texas, an enterprise which could not fail to exercise an important and favorable influence upon the future destinies of the South, *by increasing the votes of the slave-holding States in the United States Senate.*"—

* War in Texas.

Leading Southern statesmen and influential journals spoke out boldly, and avowed the *objects* for which they wished to obtain Texas.

In 1829, Abel P. Upsher said in the Virginia Convention:—

“Nothing is more fluctuating than the value of slaves. A late law of Louisiana reduced their value twenty-five per cent. in two hours after its passage was known. If it should be our lot, as I trust it will, to acquire Texas, *their price will rise.*”

Philip Doddridge, another distinguished member, said:—

“That the acquisition of Texas would greatly enhance the value of the property in question.”

Mr. Gholson said in the Virginian legislature, in 1832:—

“That the price of slaves fell *twenty-five per cent* within two hours after the news was received of the non-importation act which was passed by the Legislature of Louisiana. Yet he believed the acquisition of Texas would raise their price *fifty per cent* at least.”

Mr. Mirrick said in the Senate:—“It was his firm belief, that the annexation of Texas, as a market for slaves, would enable the South to preserve her balance in the Union—that the Union would be more *perfect—justice* be better established—*domestic tranquility* better insured—the *common defence* better provided for—the *general welfare* better promoted—and the *blessings of liberty* to ourselves and our posterity better secured.”

There has been much said, of late, about extending “the area of freedom,” by the annexation of Texas to this bloody and oppressive Union. Is any one at a loss to know what *kind* of “freedom” it is meant to extend by adding three or four hundred thousand square miles of slave territory to the “worst despotism on earth,” let him ponder these disclosures, and his doubts will soon be resolved. Such an extension of the “area of freedom,” would be

fully illustrated by the "annexation" of Turkey to Austria.

It has already been stated that the government of Mexico had abolished slavery throughout that Republic. In order to set the matter in a clearer light, the decree of July 13, 1824, prohibiting the traffic in slaves, and the final decree of President GUERRERO, utterly abolishing the system of slavery, are here inserted, together with extracts from the colonization laws of Coahula and Texas.

DECREE OF JULY 13, 1824.

Prohibition of the Commerce and Traffic in Slaves.

The Sovereign General Constituent Congress of the United Mexican States has held it right to decree the following:

1. The Commerce and Traffic in Slaves, proceeding from whatever power, and under whatever flag, is forever prohibited, within the territories of the United Mexican States.

2. The Slaves, who may be introduced contrary to the tenor of the preceding article, shall remain free in consequence of treading the Mexican soil.

3. Every vessel, whether National or Foreign, in which Slaves may be transported and introduced into the Mexican Territories, shall be confiscated with the rest of its cargo—and the Owner, Purchaser, Captain, Master and Pilot, shall suffer the punishment of ten years confinement.

Little more than five years afterwards, the following decree was promulgated by the President of Mexico.

DECREE OF PRESIDENT GUERRERO.

Abolition of Slavery.

The President of the United Mexican States, to the inhabitants of the Republic:—

Be it known: That in the year 1829, being desirous of signalizing the anniversary of our Independence by an act of national Justice and Beneficence, which may contribute

to the strength and support of such inestimable welfare, as to secure more and more the public tranquillity, and reinstate an unfortunate portion of our inhabitants in the sacred rights granted them by nature, and may be protected by the nation under wise and just laws, according to the provision in Article 30, of the Constitutive Act; availing myself of the extraordinary faculties granted me, I have thought proper to Decree;

1. That Slavery be exterminated in the Republic.
2. Consequently those are free, who, up to this day, have been looked upon as slaves.
3. Whenever the circumstances of the Public Treasury will allow it, the owners of slaves shall be indemnified, in the manner which the Laws shall provide.

JOSE MARIA DE BOCANEGRA.

Mexico, Sept. 15th, 1829, A. D.

Here follow three sections from the colonization laws of COAHUILA and TEXAS; the first exempting the colonists from burdens, and the last prohibiting them to impose *burdens* on others.

“ART. 17.—Every new settlement shall be free from all contributions whatever, for the space of ten years from the time of its establishment, except such as shall be laid generally, to prevent or repel foreign invasion.”

“ART. 35.—The new settlers, in regard to the introduction of Slaves, shall be subject to laws which now exist, and which shall hereafter be made on the subject.”

“ART. 36.—The servants and laborers which, in future foreign colonists shall introduce, shall not, by force of any contract whatever, remain bound to their service a longer space of time than ten years.”

The South foresaw, that if these decrees were enforced, the slaves of Louisiana, Arkansas, and the neighboring States would soon emancipate themselves by running across the Sabine, and taking refuge under the government of Mexico. She, therefore, stimulated the settlers to resistance, and they were totally disregarded by the colonists from the United States, who introduced large numbers of

slaves into Texas, and held them in bondage, in spite of every attempt of the Mexican authorities to execute the laws.

The *Arkansas Gazette*, a paper thoroughly identified with the slave-holding interest, held forth this language, in the year 1830, respecting the purchase of the Texas country :—

“No hopes need be entertained of our acquiring Texas, until some other party more friendly to the United States than the present, shall predominate in Mexico, and perhaps not until the people of Texas shall throw off the yoke of allegiance to that government, which they will do no doubt, so soon as they shall have a reasonable pretext for doing so. *At present, they are probably subject to as few exactions and impositions as any people under the sun.*”

The hint to the Texans to “throw off the yoke of allegiance,” was even at that early day the expression of “a consummation devoutly to be wished.” But as they had no just causes of complaint against the government of Mexico, “a decent regard to the opinions of mankind,” made it necessary for them to manufacture some for the occasion, before publishing their “declaration of independence ;” and this they were not long in doing. Before proceeding to that part of the subject, we will give a few more items of proof to the point under consideration.

About this time, the “*Mobile Advertiser*” spoke out on this wise :—

“The South wish to have Texas admitted into the Union for two reasons : First, to equalize the South with the North ; and Secondly, as a convenient and safe place, calculated from its peculiarly good soil and salubrious climate, for a slave population. The question is therefore put by the South to Congress and the country, ‘Shall we have justice done us by the admission of Texas into the Union?’”

"The following *toast* was given at a public meeting of eminent politicians at Columbia, South Carolina :—

"TEXAS—If united to our government as a state, it will prove an invaluable acquisition to the Southern States, and their *domestic institutions*."

Feeling that all their efforts to get possession of that department peaceably would prove unavailing, the Texas plotters now began to prepare for "*the last resort of nations*;" the first step to which was, the publication of a string of complaints against the government of Mexico, which they called their "*declaration of independence*."

To show that the government had given them no just cause of complaint, the reader is referred to the article from the Arkansas Gazette, just quoted, and to the several documents which follow :—

Extract of a letter from Col. S. F. Austin, Dated
MONTERREY, Jan. 17, 1834.

To the Ayuntamiento of San Felipe de Austin:

The general government are disposed to do every thing for Texas that can be done to promote its prosperity and welfare that is consistent with the constitution and laws, and I have no doubt the state government will do the same if they are applied to in a proper manner.

I have long since informed the Ayuntamiento of Texas, of the repeal of the law of April, and of the favorable and friendly disposition of the government.

Under these circumstances, the prospects of Texas are better than they ever have been. The national revolution is ended, a constitutional government exists, the people are obedient to the government and laws every where. Be the same in Texas, and have no more excitements, tolerate no more violent measures, and you will prosper and obtain

War in Texas.

from the government all that reasonable men ought to ask for.

Respectfully your most obedient servant,

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN.

A correspondent of the *New York Commercial Advertiser*, for whose trustworthiness the editor vouched, wrote as follows, Sept. 14, 1836 :

"I came to Texas seven years since, possessed, as I thought, of good titles to a league of land, purchased in New York, of an individual, who, to my certain knowledge, had sold many other leagues. On my arrival, I immediately applied to the proper officer to be put in possession of my land, when, much to my surprise, I was told that my titles were good for nothing ; but was informed at the same time that I was welcome to land, and that I might select any vacant land. I accordingly possessed myself of a league of fine land, took the oath of allegiance to Mexico, and have lived in prosperity and happiness till the Texan revolution, since which time I must confess I have tasted more bitterness, grief and trouble than I had done in all my past life before. The like declaration will be made by every American who settled in Texas, whenever they can do so without the fears that make them mute. I now allude to those Americans who had been settlers for any time, and who had fulfilled the conditions entitling them to their lands, and *not for those who came for the express purpose of sowing a rebellion*, organized and matured by those who had forged or had purchased forged titles to lands, and were in advance, determined to create a rebellion that they might perfect those titles."

The following is an extract from an address of a General Convention of Texas settlers, opposed to the proceedings of the conspirators, held in November, 1834.

"When a country is in a prosperous and flourishing condition ; when the mass of the people are contented and happy ; when all are industriously employed in their respective pursuits ; it surely is a most unwise policy in any man or set of men to arouse dissensions among them, and scatter the seeds of discord and confusion. And we ask

the people, we call upon the 'old settlers,' the pioneers, who have borne the brunt and hardships of populating the wilderness, if they have ever known a time when the prospects of the country were more flattering than at present!" "We ask you in the spirit of candor, and with the privileges of first pioneers, has the Government ever exacted *any thing* unreasonable of Texas? If it has, we *must*, before God and our country, say we know it not. Again, for your experimental knowledge shall bear us out; has it ever burdened you with taxes, or the performance of arduous, expensive, or perilous duties? Nay, has Texas ever borne *any part* in the expenses of sustaining the Government that protects her citizens, their lives, their liberty, and their property?"

Another address put forth in 1835, the year the war commenced, by an assembly of delegates from every precinct of Texas, states that some merchants, importers of goods, had refused to pay duties, that a lawless coast from *Nueces* to the *Sabine* had been the result; that a mob had made prisoners of and disarmed a detachment of soldiers stationed to support the revenue officers at *Anahuac*; and that some Mexicans had been shot as spies. The address goes on:

"That such outrages on the Government under which we live, should have been committed by some individuals is much, very much to be lamented. But it is still more to be lamented, that Texas, whose interests lie in peace, and the *majority* of whose citizens are peaceful, should be dragged into a collision with their *own* Government, by the precipitate and unjustifiable acts of a *few*. It is not that Government, which has committed on us aggression. It is a certain part of the Texas inhabitants, who have proved to be the *unprovoked and unnecessary aggressors*."

"The document above quoted may be found in Edward's *History of Texas*. The war party is thus described by the historian, who was residing in Texas, as the preceptor of a seminary:

"I think I hear the reader exclaim, as every honest, sober, peaceful citizen of Texas did at the time, (1834, 1835,) Good God, what a set of deceitful, ambitious, and ungrateful men have got into our country." "They were joined

by their best friends, the slave-holders, who said their negroes, God d—n 'em, were on the tiptoe of expectation, and rejoicing that the Mexicans were coming to make them free.' 'The alarming party were few in comparison, but they were talented, systematized, closely connected, and indefatigable in their endeavors to infuse suspicions against the General Government, and commit the country without the possibility of a recall.' 'This party has increased a hundred fold since 1832, by bad slave-holders, who have had two cargoes distributed among them by African kidnappers.' 'At this time, the public press in Brazoria, (the only one in Texas,) had been taken possession of by the united company of *Whigs*, as they termed themselves, but according to the opposition *majority*, land-jobbers, lawless merchants, slave-holders, office-seekers, and vain grog-drinking boasters. Resolutions and addresses were distributed in every quarter by a committee of men appointed expressly for that purpose.' 'They threatened the peaceable inhabitants, whom they called *Tories*, with their vengeance, if they dared to interrupt them in their high-handed proceedings.' 'Still the addresses from the people or farmers to the Mexican authorities were of the most friendly and peaceable character, but those from the agitators, and would-be office or land-holders, were of the most threatening and dangerous sort.' "

And yet while these "men of Belial," were thus riding rough-shod over the Mexican authorities, and trampling on the rights of the peaceful citizens, they were complaining of the "tyranny and oppression" of the Government. And as a specimen of what they complained of, we here insert two articles from their "list of grievances."

"It [the general government] denies us the right of worshipping the Almighty according to the dictates of our consciences—by the support of a national religion, calculated to promote the temporal interests of its human functionaries, rather than the glory of the true and living God."

The next extract is as follows:—

"It has failed and refused to secure on a firm basis the

right of trial by jury, that palladium of civil liberty, and only safe guarantee for the life, liberty and property of the citizens."

As an answer to this charge, it may be stated : that notwithstanding the " trial by jury " was unknown to the jurisprudence of Spain, from which Mexico derived her institutions, measures were already adopted for its establishment in that country, as the following article from the constitution of Coahula and Texas will prove.

" 192. One of the principal subjects for the attention of Congress, [State Legislature,] shall be to establish in criminal cases, the trial by jury, extending it gradually, and even adopting it in civil cases, in proportion as the advantages of this precious institution may be practically developed."

The certainty of success which promised to crown the efforts of the slave-breeders, to wrest Texas from Mexico, had already given a fresh impulse to the Havana slave-trade, by opening a new field of operations to the *enterprising* citizens of the United States, who now engaged in their old business of man-stealing on a large scale.

The following extract from a report of the British commissioners for the suppression of the slave-trade, appointed to reside in Cuba under the treaty of 1817, will throw some light on this subject. The report is dated Jan. 1, 1836 ; the extract as follows :—

" Never since the establishment of this mixed commission has the slave-trade of the Havana reached such a disgraceful pitch, as during the year 1835. By the list, we have the honor to enclose, it will be seen that fifty slave vessels have safely arrived in this port during the year just expired. In 1833, there were twenty-seven arrivals, and in 1834, thirty-three ; but 1835 presents a number, by means of which there must have been landed upwards of fifteen thousand negroes.

In the spring of last year, an *American agent from Texas* purchased in the Havanna two hundred and fifty newly imported Africans, at two hundred and seventy-five dollars per head, and carried them away with him to that district of Mexico. This, perhaps, would have been scarcely worth mentioning to your lordship, had we not learned, that within the last six weeks considerable sums of money have been deposited by the *American citizens* in certain mercantile houses here, for the purpose of making additional purchases of bozal negroes for Texas. A great impulse is thus given to this illicit traffic of the Havanna. We thought the first experiment to be of little consequence—but now that we perceive *fresh commissions arriving in the Havanna*, for the purchase of Africans, we cannot refrain from calling your lordship's attention to the fact, as being another cause of the increase of the slave trade of the Havanna."

The foregoing throws light on the following recent article in the Albany Argus:—

"The fate of Henry Bartow, late of the Commercial Bank of this city, has at length been definitely ascertained. The agent sent out by the Bank has returned, and states that Bartow died at Marianna, near Columbia in Texas, on the 30th of June last, of the fever of the country, after an illness of about four weeks. He had purchased a farm on the Brazos, and, in company with a native of the country, had commenced an extensive plantation, and sent \$10,000 to Cuba for the purchase of slaves."

But as the "democracy" had been chiefly instrumental in "opening up" this new market for the bodies and souls of men, Cuba was not long suffered to enjoy the rich profits of this lucrative traffic; for as soon as the Texans got time to make a "constitution,"—acting on the reciprocal principle, that "one good turn deserves another,"—they set this matter right, by inserting in that instrument a provision, punishing as pirates any who should thereafter

be so wicked as to defraud the Americans of their dues, by bringing slaves into that "Republic," from any other country than the United States.^o

The preparations which had been so long in progress were at length completed, and soon the forcible resistance to the laws assumed a systematic form—a state of war existed; and although Texas did not declare in form,—as the "mother" of this young "harlot" has since done,—she did in fact declare, that the "war existed by the act of Mexico."[†]

The battle was now fairly begun. Large meetings of "sympathizers" were held in most of the principal cities and towns in the west, and on the sea-board; flaming advertisements were inserted in Southern and Western newspapers, calling on the lovers of *liberty* to go and assist the "Texas patriots." The state arsenal at Cincinnati was emptied of its arms, and volunteers rushed in crowds "to the rescue," until the battle of San Jacinto decided the controversy, and doomed Mexico to dismemberment, if not to ruin. The "independence" of Texas was achieved, and propositions were made to be admitted as a new State to the American Union.

The bloody meteor emblazoned on its banner had scarcely burst from the murky clouds of eternal slavery, when it was proposed to incorporate it with the bloodier "stars and stripes" of the "Northern Republic." When the baleful light of that "lone star" first gleamed across our country, its lurid glare sent terror and dismay to the hearts of millions of our race. It was a sign in the political heavens, which foreboded the long continuance of the terrible night of slavery.

^o See Constitution of Texas. [†] Declaration of War against Mexico, by Congress, Aug. 11, 1846.

But, Texas, as we have hinted, did not gain her independence alone and unaided. Left to herself, as we have clearly shown, she would never have sought it. Henry A. Wise boasted, that

"It was the people of the great valley who conquered Santa Anna at San Jacinto; and three-fourths of them, after winning that glorious field, had returned peaceably to their homes."²

To show that Wise spoke the truth, we here insert some of the "Notices" above alluded to. The following is from a North Carolina paper:—

"WHO WILL GO TO TEXAS?—Major J. H. Harry, of Lincolnton, has been authorized by me, with the consent of Major General Hunt, an agent in the western counties of North Carolina, to receive and enrol volunteer emigrants to Texas, and will conduct such as may wish to emigrate to that Republic, about the first of October next, at the expense of the Republic of Texas.

J. P. HENDERSON,
Brig. Gen'l. of Texian Army.

August, 1836."

The following will give some idea of the extent to which these operations were carried on:—

THREE HUNDRED MEN FOR TEXAS.—General Dunlap, of Tennessee, is about to proceed to Texas with the above number of men. The whole corps are now at Memphis. They will not, it is said, pass this way. Every man is completely armed, the corps having been originally raised for the Florida War. This force, we have no doubt, will be able to carry every thing before it.—*Vicksburg Register*.

In the summer of 1846, Capt. Lawrence opened a recruiting office in Front Street, Cincinnati, for the purpose

² Speech in Congress, April, 1842.

of enlisting "emigrants," for Texas. A public meeting was called to raise funds and fill up the ranks, at which N. C. Read, United States district attorney for Ohio, attended, and made a speech in favor of the objects; and a committee was chosen to help carry them out. An interesting notice of these proceedings was taken by Charles Hammond, Esq., and published in the Cincinnati Daily Gazette.

That the "volunteer emigrants" were not alone in this piratical crusade, will be seen by the following:—

"General Gaines was authorized to cross the boundary line with his army; to *march seventy miles* into the Mexican territory; and to occupy the military post of Nacogdoches, *in case he should judge it expedient in order to guard against Indian depredations!*—And further: he was likewise authorized to call upon the Governors of several of the *south-western States* for an additional number of troops, *should he consider it necessary.*"

"In order to furnish an excuse for the exercise of the authority thus delegated to him, many false rumors of Indian depredations and hostile movements were reported to the Commander of the United States forces, and he did not neglect the occasion for pushing to the *very extent* of his *conditional* instructions. He even went so far that the Executive became alarmed, *lest the "neutrality" of our Government should be violated!!* Yet he is still permitted to keep an imposing force stationed in the Mexican territory; and it is understood that he is in regular correspondence with the chiefs of the insurgent armies; also that his men are 'deserting' and joining them in great numbers."²

On the subject of these "desertions" hear the following, from the *Pensacola Gazette*:—

"About the middle of last month, General Gaines sent an officer of the United States army into Texas to reclaim

² War in Texas, p. 29.

some deserters. He found them already enlisted in the Texian service to the number of *two hundred*. They still wore the uniform of our army, but refused of course to return. The commander of the Texian forces was applied to, to enforce their return; but his only reply was, that the soldiers might go, but he had no authority to send them back."

Thus it appears, that while these lawless desperadoes were in the act of plundering Mexico of one of her fairest provinces, for the purpose of annexing it to the United States, as a new market, in which republican slave breeders and slave traders might ply their infernal traffic, the army of this same nation was hovering near, ready to aid the plunderers, if their aid should be needed. As a proof of this, read the following extract of a letter from an officer in the United States army, published at the time, in the *Army and Navy Chronicle*. Speaking of the advance of Gen. Gaines' troops to Nacogdoches, he says:—

"It is to create the impression in Texas and Mexico, that the Government of the United States takes a part in the controversy. It is in fact lending to the cause of Texas all the aid which it can derive from the countenance and apparent support of the United States, besides placing our troops in a situation to take an actual part in aid of the Texans, in case a reverse of their affairs should render aid necessary. The pretext of the anticipated invasion from the Indians in that quarter is unsupported by the least probable testimony, although Gen. Houston has issued a proclamation, dated at Nacogdoches, ordering out a body of two hundred Texian militia 'to sustain the United States force at this place, until reinforcements can arrive from Gen. Gaines.'"

In the letter of Mr. Clay, to the National Intelligencer, dated, Raleigh, April 17, 1844, he says:—

"The signal success of that revolution was greatly aided, if not wholly achieved, by citizens of the United States who had migrated to Texas."

Mr. Van Buren, in his letter to Mr. Hammett, April 20, 1844, testifies to the same thing ; he says :—

“ Nothing is either more true or more extensively known, than that Texas was wrested from Mexico, and her independence established through the instrumentality of citizens of the United States.”

Such are the purposes for which Mexico was at first invaded, and despoiled of more than one hundred and sixty thousand square miles of territory ; and such the means by which these purposes have been accomplished. How she has been more recently robbed of the territory—as James K. Polk tells us in his late message—“ larger than the thirteen original States of this Union,”—will be seen hereafter.

As soon as the Texians had gained the battle of San Jacinto, they demanded to be “ annexed to the United States.” Not in the tone of suppliants—quite the contrary ; with the butt of their slave whips—while their knuckles were dripping with blood—they were found on the steps, thundering at the door for admission to the Union. The South was ready for the measure, as she ever had been. But the North hesitated, and wavered.

The proposition was at first a startling one to the “ free States,” as they are called,—as if in derision. And many of their legislatures passed wordy “ resolves ” against the measure, declaring that “ Congress had no power to annex a foreign nation to the United States ”—as if their long experience had not taught them, that a slave-holding Congress has “ power ” to do any thing which the interests of slavery demanded—and declaring “ that no act done, or compact made, for such a purpose, by the Government of the United States, will be binding on the States or the People.”^{*} But the South knew her men. They had of their own accord,

^{*} See Resolves of Massachusetts Legislature 1838, of Vermont, 1837, also of Rhode Island, Ohio, and Michigan.

harnessed themselves to her bloody car;† And patiently had they drawn it for more than fifty years. True they had occasionally threatened to kick,—not to kick out of the traces—excepting once—‡ but only to kick,§—when they felt its burdens so intolerably heavy, as to gall them to blood. But then a few cracks of her *whip* had always brought them to *submission* again,—never to their senses—and she well knew it would be so now. So she laughed at their bluster, and managed the whole affair in her own way, as she had ever done, and as *drivers* always do.

But even the patient ox has been known to get *breachy*; and the staid “sons of the pilgrims” *might* also become restive, if their yoke was suddenly made too heavy. The South knew that the annexation of Texas would be to the thrifty men of the North somewhat like burdening them with the support of a broken down and crippled young pauper vagabond; and allowing them his rickety crutches as an indemnity: And she knew further, that time and familiarity would work marvellous changes in men’s feelings; Nor was she a stranger to the fact, that many of these same thrifty Northerners loved *money*; and set a high value on *cotton*; and cotton had already begun to grow in Texas;—and sheetings from Lowell were sold there. So she took counsel of these things, and waited for a “more convenient season.”

The year 1844 brought with it a Presidential election, and at this period the South resolved to make the grand issue. The North was loyal to the Union; And she was given to *compromising*. She had compromised in the beginning; and again in 1820, when Missouri came in. And

† By adopting the Constitution. ‡ See proceedings of the Hartford Convention. § See the address of twenty members of Congress, 1842. Also Resolves of Massachusetts Legislature, March 26, 1845.

the South knew that she would compromise again, if a little time was given. So to *familiarize* them with the subject, she "kept it before the people," in her Journals, and public speeches at Annexation meetings, and toasts at political gatherings.

The two prominent candidates for the Presidency were Henry Clay of Kentucky, and Martin Van Buren of New York. The former was a slave-holder; and although the latter had long been known as a "Northern man with southern principles," the South distrusted him. She was afraid that he was not "sound to the core" on the subject of her favorite measure. To put the matter at rest therefore, and to get the issue fairly before the people at the coming election, the two rival, and several other candidates who "offered," were requested to give a public expression of their views of the annexation of Texas.

The reply of Clay, the Whig candidate, was evasive. To the question as put to him from different parts of the country, he returned various answers. In his letter to the National Intelligencer, dated Raleigh, April 17, 1844, he holds the following, among other contrary sentiments:—

"Under these circumstances, if the government of the United States were to acquire Texas, it would require along with it all the incumbrances which Texas is under, and among them the actual or suspended war between Mexico and Texas. Of that consequence, there cannot be a doubt. *Annexation and war with Mexico are identical.* Now, for one, I certainly am not willing to involve this country in a foreign war for the object of acquiring Texas." * * *

"If any European nation entertain any ambitious designs upon Texas, such as that of colonizing her or in any way subjugating her, I should regard it as the imperative duty of the government of the United States to oppose to such designs the most firm and determined resistance, to the extent, if necessary, of appealing to arms to

prevent the accomplishment of any such designs." * * *

"I consider the annexation of Texas, at this time, without the assent of Mexico, as a measure compromising the national character, involving us certainly with Mexico, probably with other foreign powers, dangerous to the integrity of the Union, inexpedient in the present financial condition of the country, and not called for by any general expression of public opinion."

Mr. Van Buren, the Democratic candidate, expressed himself as decidedly opposed to the measure under existing circumstances: Yet he sums up his views as follows:—

"If, after the whole subject had been brought before the country and fully discussed, as it now will be, the Senate and House of Representatives, a large portion of the former, and the whole of the latter, having been chosen by the people after the question of annexation had been brought before the country for its mature consideration, should express an opinion in favor of annexation, I would hold it to be my further duty to employ the executive power to carry into full and fair effect the wishes of a majority of the people of the existing States, thus constitutionally and solemnly expressed."

This answer produced the greatest excitement among the circle of political democrats at the Capitol. The Washington correspondent of the *Liberator*, under the date of April 28, 1844, says:—

"There is the greatest possible commotion here among the political elements. The southern portion of the *Democracy* are furious at Van Buren's letter; for their watchword is, 'Now, or never.' There is considerable chance that he will be dropped, and Tyler, Cass, or Calhoun, taken up."

He was mistaken, however, in regard to the slave-holder candidate, as almost every body else was.

Several others, who were anxious to secure the nomination, expressed themselves as decidedly favorable to annexation.

But the answer of James K. Polk left no doubt among the slave-holders, as to their man. The following is from the first paragraph, dated, "*Columbia, Tenn., April 23, 1844*:"—

"GENTLEMEN:—I have no hesitation in declaring that I am in favor of the *immediate re-annexation* of Texas to the territory and government of the United States."

"*Immediate re-annexation!*" There was something so *deliberate* and straight forward in this, as to be entirely satisfactory, even to the unscrupulous villains who rule this nation.

The Baltimore Convention assembled on the 27th of May. Mr. Van Buren was the idol of the democratic party; and large numbers of the delegates from the North had gone there, pledged to his support. But slavery had been holding a conclave. And James K. Polk, of Tennessee, was selected as her most fitting tool. And Mr. Van Buren was unanimously dashed into the sea of political oblivion, because he possessed one virtuous principle to much; and his worshippers were compelled to forego the pleasure of his nomination, and to vote for a man whom nine tenths of them never before heard of. This was a terrible stroke to the Northern "democracy;" but their necks were under the yoke, and although at first they exhibited strong symptoms of rebellion, a few smart frieks of the goad, and cracks of the whip, brought them to quiet submission again, and they have since trudged along with their burdens, as docile as ever.

Pending these proceedings, John Tyler, the "accident-

al " President, had negotiated a treaty with Mr. Van Zandt, the Texan Minister, for the annexation of Texas, as "a territory of the United States;" by which the United States "assumed and agreed to pay the public debts and liabilities of Texas, *however created*, which were estimated not to exceed TEN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS."*

Mexico had frequently declared her intention of subjugating Texas to her authority; and that any attempt to annex that province to the United States would be regarded by her as an act of war. In the letter of Mr. Bocanegra to Mr. Thompson, dated August 23, 1843, he said:—

"That the Mexican Government will consider equivalent to a *declaration of war* against the Mexican republic, the passage of an act for the incorporation of Texas into the territory of the United States—the *certainly of the fact being sufficient for the immediate proclamation of a war.*"

But what of these threats; This nation had fought for the extension of slavery before, and John Tyler, the chief kidnapper of the nation, had resolved to fight for Texas, for the same purpose now, as will soon appear.

This contract was "done at Washington, the twelfth day of April, eighteen hundred and forty-four;" and was signed on the part of the United States by John C. Calhoun, and on the part of Texas by Isaac Van Zandt, and J. Pinkney Henderson.

While these proceedings were going on in the dark councils of the Cabinet at Washington, a large naval force under Commodore Conner, was concentrated in the Gulf, and kept hovering along the coast of Mexico, while a considerable military force was known to approach the frontiers of Texas and settle down on the banks of the Sabine.

* See article V, of the treaty of annexation.

When the bargain had been struck, it was submitted to the Senate for ratification. That body sat with closed doors during their deliberations. But the overseers outside were unremitting in their efforts to coerce it into a compliance with this measure. Washington letter writers for the Northern press, also busied themselves with strenuous efforts to get the excitement up to the right pitch in that quarter, by representing that if Texas was not secured now, it would be lost forever.

The Washington Correspondent of the Journal of Commerce, under date of March 30. 1844, says :—

“General Henderson arrived on Thursday; Mr. Calhoun, yesterday. The treaty of annexation of Texas to the United States will now be negotiated, and in a short time be laid before the Senate for ratification. Neither the government nor the people of Texas will consent to any postponement of the question of annexation beyond this session of Congress. The national enthusiasm of the people of Texas, in view of the prospect of annexation, is overwhelming and irrepressible. If the government of the United States postpone or refuse to ratify a treaty of annexation, the revulsion of the public mind in Texas will prove fatal to any farther negotiation on this subject ;—and Gen. Henderson, as *he is believed to be instructed*, will proceed to England and negotiate with that government a commercial treaty on the basis of free trade, which will forever put at rest any farther desire on the part of the people of Texas to be annexed to the United States.

Texas will become a great commercial depot for the trade of England and other European powers. The commerce of Texas, Mexico, and Central America, will be lost to this country. The agricultural interests of Texas will become antagonistical to the agricultural interests of our southern States, and in a few years Texas will raise every bale of cotton necessary for the consumption of the English manufactories. *English emigration, English capital, English commerce, English enterprise, and Eng-*

lish influence, will overwhelm and swallow up everything that is American, and estrange the people of Texas from their loyalty to the United States. WHAT WILL THE SENATE DO?"

The correspondent of the New-York Herald, writing from the same place, says:—

"GEN. HENDERSON, the new minister from Texas, has a carte blanche to form a treaty of annexation with Texas—to comply with exactly such terms as our government may dictate. He was appointed by President Houston, in obedience to the secret instructions of the Texan Congress—Houston himself being opposed to the annexation with the United States, but preferring that with England."

"In case the American government should refuse to accept the proposition of annexation, then General Henderson is authorized to proceed immediately to England, and to propose an alliance of some kind with that power, either as a colony, or some other independent shape."

"The question of annexation must also be determined before the termination of the present session of Congress. This is the third time which Texas has knocked at the door of the Union for admission since 1837, and if the treaty of annexation be refused now, the decision is final and fatal, both to Texas and to the United States. IT IS THE LAST CHANCE."

Again, the same writer unburdens himself as follows:—

WASHINGTON, March 31, 1844.

"First and foremost, in point of irresistible necessity, are the affairs of Texas. Her crisis is come. Her necessities are upon her, not in the future, but in the present—she cannot wait. The case is issued, the sheriff's hand is already upon the victim's shoulder, and the only alternatives are bail or jail."

"The time now is come when Texas must and will either unite with us, or depart from us—be for us or against us—come under the protection of the aegis of the American Eagle, or crouch beneath the paw of the British Lion—when her untold and incalculable agricultural and com-

mercial resources shall go to enrich either these United States, or the kingdom of Great Britain. General Henderson is now here with plenary powers; and *before he leaves us, and before this Congress adjourns, the fate of Texas must be definitely settled.*"

There was doubtless much truth in these representations in regard to the *necessities* of Texas. For we have already seen that she was completely bankrupt; and unless she could get "annexed" to the United States, and thereby compel the industrious and enterprising sons of the North to assume her debts and maintain her, she must forever remain so. But there was no danger that Texas would become "annexed" to Great Britain; as there existed no slave-holding affinities between the two countries.

The injunction of secrecy was at length removed, and the treaty, with the accompanying documents, were published to the world. Their revelations were truly astounding. The treaty—some notice of which has already been taken—defined no boundaries to Texas whatever; but left it to include as much of the Mexican territory as the "contracting parties" could lay their hands on.

Accompanying the treaty, was a long correspondence, carried on since 1842, between different Texian Ministers and Secretaries of State of the United States, in which the latter had expressed strong desires to get speedy possession of Texas, as the only means of propagating the race of slave-holders, and saving the infernal system from extinction, let the consequences of such a step be what they would. Some extracts from these extraordinary documents are here given upon which the reader can furnish his own comments. About this time England was supposed to be exerting her influence to obtain the abolition of slavery in Texas.

On this subject, Mr. Upsher, Secretary of State of the United States, wrote numerous letters to Mr. Murphy,

Minister to Texas, from which we make extracts. August 8, 1843, he wrote as follows :—

“ A movement of this kind cannot be contemplated by us in silence. Such an attempt upon any neighboring country would necessarily be viewed with very deep concern; but when it is made upon a nation whose territories join the *slave-holding States of our Union*, it awakens a still more solemn interest. It cannot be permitted to succeed, without the most strenuous efforts on our part, to arrest a calamity so serious to every part of our country.”

* * * * *

“ The establishment in the very midst of our *slave-holding States*, of an independent government, forbidding the existence of slavery, and by a people born, for the most part, among us, reared up in our habits, and speaking our language, could not fail to produce the most unhappy effects upon both parties. If Texas were in that condition, her territory would afford a refuge for the fugitive slaves of Louisiana and Arkansas, and would hold out to them an encouragement to run away, which no municipal regulation of ours could possibly counteract.”

“ The States immediately interested would be most likely to take the subject into their own hands. They would perceive that *there could not be any security for that species of property*, if the mere crossing of a geographical line could give freedom to the slave. It is not to be supposed that a people, conscious of the power to protect themselves, would long submit to such a state of things. They would assume to reclaim their slaves by force; and for that purpose would invade the territory of Texas. It is not difficult to see that quarrels and war would soon grow out of this state of things. If this government should make itself a party in asserting the rights of the slave-holder, the result could not fail to be unfavorable to Texas. Few calamities could befall this country more to be deplored, than the establishment of a predominant British influence, and the abolition of domestic slavery in Texas.”

Murphy to Upsher, September 23, 1843.

“ Pardon me if I am too solicitous on this subject. I feel the deep interest at stake. Our whole *southern in-*

interests are involved in the negotiation, and with it the interests of this Union itself. The great blow to our *civil institutions* is to be struck here, and it will be a fatal blow, if not timely arrested."

"England is anxious to get rid of the Constitution of Texas, because it secures, in the most nervous and clear language, the rights of the master to his slave—and it also prohibits the introduction of slaves into Texas from any other nation or quarter than the United States."

"Now, all the United States has to do is, to aid the people of Texas in sustaining their Constitution, which, while it effectually secures the rights of the master, secures to the people the blessings of civil, political, and religious liberty."

On the following day he wrote as follows:—

"The Constitution of Texas secures to the master the PERPETUAL RIGHT TO HIS SLAVE, and prohibits the introduction of slaves into Texas from any other quarter than the United States."

"If the United States preserves and secures to Texas the possession of her Constitution and present form of government, then have we gained all we can desire, and also all that Texas asks or wishes."

Mr. Upsher to Mr. Murphy, September 23, 1843.

"So far as this Government is concerned, it has every desire to come to the aid of Texas, in the most prompt and effectual manner. How far we shall be supported by the people, I regret to say is somewhat doubtful. There is no reason to fear that there will be any difference of opinion among the slave-holding States; and there is a large number in the non-slave-holding with views sufficiently liberal to embrace a policy absolutely necessary to the salvation of the south, although, in some respects, objectionable to themselves."

Mr. Upsher to Mr. Murphy, November 21, 1843.

"It is impossible to be too watchful or too diligent in a matter which involves such momentous consequences, not

only to our country, but to the whole civilized world. The view which the government takes of it excludes every idea of mere sectional interest. We regard it as involving the *security of the South*; and the strength and prosperity of every part of the Union."

Upsher to Murphy, January 16, 1844.

"But this is not all. If Texas should refuse to come into our Union, measures will instantly be taken to fill her territory with emigrants from Europe. Extensive arrangements for this have already been made, and they will be carried into effect as soon as the decision of Texas shall be known."

"But the first measure of the new emigrants, as soon as they shall have sufficient strength, will be, to destroy that grand *domestic institution*, upon which so much of the prosperity of our frontier country depends. To this, England will stimulate them, and she will also furnish the means of accomplishing it.—I have commented upon this topic in a dispatch to Mr. Everett. I will add, that *if Texas should not be attached to the United States, she cannot maintain that institution ten years, and probably not half that time.*"

In the letter of Mr. Upsher to Benjamin Green, Minister to Mexico, on the subject of the treaty of annexation, dated April 19, 1844, he says:—

"It (the executive) has taken this step, in *full view of all possible consequences.*"

At the same time, Great Britain was cautioned against thrusting in any of her anti-slavery interference in this matter, on this wise:—

Mr. Calhoun to Mr. Packenham, British Minister, April 18, 1844.

"It is with still deeper concern that the President regards the avowal of Lord Aberdeen, of the desire of Great Britain to see *slavery abolished in Texas*: and, as

he infers, is endeavoring, through her diplomacy, to accomplish it by making the abolition of slavery one of the conditions on which Mexico should acknowledge her independence. Under this conviction, it is felt to be the imperious duty of the Federal Government, *the common representative and protector of these states of the Union*, to adopt, in self-defence, *the most effectual measures to defeat it.*"

Calhoun to Packenham, April 27, 1844.

"The United States, in concluding the treaty of annexation with Texas, are not disposed to shun any responsibility which may fairly attach to them on account of the transaction. The measure was adopted by the mutual consent, and for the mutual and permanent welfare of the two countries interested. It was made necessary, in order to *preserve domestic institutions*, placed under the guaranty of their respective constitutions, and deemed essential to their safety and prosperity."

These official papers show, beyond a cavil what the design of the government was, in annexing Texas, and that it had determined to push this design to its accomplishment, regardless of consequences.

The Senate also called on the Executive for the orders, if any, which had been given to the military and naval commanders heretofore alluded to. In communicating to the Senate, the orders which he had given to General Taylor, and Commodore Conner, the President says :—

"I have to inform the Senate that, in consequence of the declaration of Mexico communicated to this Government, and by me laid before Congress at the opening of its present session, announcing the determination of Mexico to regard as a declaration of war against her by the United States the definitive ratification of any treaty with Texas annexing the territory of that republic to the United States, and the hope and belief entertained by the Executive that the treaty with Texas for that purpose would be speedily approved and ratified by the Senate, it was regarded by the Executive to have become emphatically its

duty to concentrate, in the Gulf of Mexico and its vicinity, as a precautionary measure, as large a portion of the home squadron under the command of Captain Conner as could well be drawn together ; and, at the same time, to assemble at Fort Jesup, on the borders of Texas, as large a military force as the demands of the service at other encampments would authorize to be detached.”†

In the very midst of these warlike demonstrations upon Mexico, the President was making loud professions of friendship, and an earnest desire to preserve the friendly relations existing between the two Republics. In the message accompanying the treaty, he says:—

“To Mexico, the Executive is disposed to pursue a course conciliatory in its character, and at the same time to render her the most ample justice, by conventions and stipulations not inconsistent with the rights and dignity of the government.”

The course which he had pursued so far was about as “conciliatory in its character,” as that of the highway man, who, with a pistol at the throat of his victim, commands him to “deliver or die.” And then like the pirate on the high seas, after plundering her of her possessions, he had prepared “to render her the most ample justice” at the mouth of the cannon.

That John Tyler knew that a state of war at that time existed between Mexico and Texas, and that he was endeavoring to involve this nation in that war, by espousing the quarrel of the latter, we have his own confession; for a little farther on in the same message he says:—

“It (the Executive) has made known to Mexico, at several periods, its extreme anxiety to witness the termination of hostilities between that country and Texas.”

“The war which has been waged for eight years has resulted only in the conviction, with all other than her-

† Message to the Senate, May 15, 1844.

self, that Texas cannot be re-conquered. I cannot but repeat the opinion expressed in my message at the opening of Congress, that it is time it had ceased."

A plain spoken man might also say, that he knew he was lying when he said, "that Texas cannot be re-conquered;" for he immediately goes on:—

"I repeat, the Executive saw Texas in a state of *almost hopeless exhaustion*, and the question was narrowed down to the simple proposition, whether the United States should accept the boon of annexation upon fair and even liberal terms, or, by refusing to do so, force Texas to seek REFUGE in the arms of some other power."

Although Thomas H. Benton of Missouri, was deeply anxious to get possession of Texas, as we have already shown, he had not the brazen assurance to claim the Rio del Norte as its western boundary. He well knew that such a claim was a gross outrage on the rights of Mexico; that it was an attempt to rob her of an immense tract of her territory, including large portions of four distinct States, in addition to Texas, and he had the honesty and manliness to avow it. In a letter to the Texan Congress, dated April, 30, 1844, he says:—

"Of course, I, who consider what I am about, always speak of Texas as constituted at the time of the treaty of 1819, and not as constituted by the Republic of Texas, comprehending the capital and forty towns and villages of New Mexico! now and always as fully under the dominion of the Republic of Mexico, as Quebec and all the towns and villages of Canada are under the dominion of Great Britain!"

In his masterly speech on the treaty, May 6th, 1844, he said:—

"Let us pause and look at our new and important proposed acquisitions in this quarter. First: there is the department, formerly the province of New Mexico, lying on

both sides of the river, from its head spring to near the Paso del Norte—that is to say, half way down the river. This department is studded with towns and villages—is populated—well cultivated—and covered with flocks and herds. On its left bank, (for I only speak of the part which we propose to re-annex,) is, first, the frontier village, Taos, 3000 souls, and where the custom house is kept at which the Missonri caravans enter their goods. Then comes Santa Fe, the capital, 4000 souls; then Albuquerque, 6000 souls; then comes scores of other towns and villages—all more or less populated, and surrounded by flocks and fields. Then come the departments of Chihuahua, Coahuila and Tamaulipas, without settlements on the left bank of the river, but occupying the right bank, and commanding the left. All this—being parts of four Mexican departments, now under Mexican Governors and Governments—is permanently re-annexed to this Union if this treaty is ratified, and is actually re-annexed from the moment of the signature of the treaty, according to the President's last message, to remain so until the acquisition is rejected by rejecting the treaty! The one-half of the department of New Mexico, with its capital, becomes a Territory of the United States: an angle of Chihuahua, at the Paso del Norte, famous for its wine, also becomes ours; a part of the department of Coahuila, not populated on the left bank, which we take, but commanded from the right bank by Mexican authorities; the same of Tamaulipas, the ancient Nuevo San Tander, (New St. Andrew,) and which covers both sides of the river from its mouth for some hundred miles up, and all the left bank of which is in the power and possession of Mexico. These, in addition to the old Texas—these parts of four States—these towns and villages—these people and territory—these flocks and herds—this slice of the Republic of Mexico, two thousand miles long and some hundred broad—all this our President has cut off from its mother empire, and presents to us, and declares it is ours till the Senate rejects it! He calls it Texas! and the cutting off he calls re-annexation! Humboldt calls it New Mexico, Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Nuevo San Tander, (now Tamaulipas;) and the civilized world may qualify this re-annexation by the application of some odious and terrible epithet. Demosthenes advised the people of Athens not to

take, but to re-take a certain city; and in that re-laid the virtue which saved the act from the character of spoliation and robbery. Will it be equally potent with us? and will the 're,' prefixed to the annexation, legitimate the seizure of two thousand miles of a neighbor's dominion, with whom we have treaties of peace, and friendship, and commerce? Will it legitimate this seizure, made by virtue of a treaty with Texas, when no Texan force—witness the disastrous expeditions to Mier and to Santa Fe—have been seen near it without being killed or taken, to the last man?"

"I wash my hands of all attempts to *dismember the Mexican Republic, by seizing her dominions in New Mexico, Chihuahua, Coahuila and Tamaulipas*. The treaty, IN ALL THAT RELATES TO THE BOUNDARY OF THE RIO GRANDE, IN AN ACT OF UNPARALLELED OUTRAGE ON MEXICO. IT IS THE SEIZURE OF TWO THOUSAND MILES OF HER TERRITORY, without a word of explanation with her, and by virtue of a treaty with Texas, to which she is no party. Our Secretary of State, in his letter to the United States Charge in Mexico, and seven days after the treaty was signed, and after the Mexican minister had withdrawn from our seat of Government, shows full well that *he was conscious of THE ENORMITY OF THIS OUTRAGE*; knew it was war; and proffered volunteer apologies to avert the consequences which he knew he had provoked." * * *

"By this declaration, the thirty thousand Mexicans in the left half of the valley of the Rio del Norte are our citizens, and standing, in the language of the President's message, in a hostile attitude towards us, and subject to be repelled as invaders. Taos, the seat of the custom-house, where our caravans enter their goods, is ours; Santa Fe, the capital of New Mexico, is ours; Governor Armijo is our Governor, and subject to be tried for treason if he does not submit to us; twenty Mexican towns and villages are ours; and their peaceful inhabitants, cultivating their fields and tending their flocks, are suddenly converted, by a stroke of the President's pen, into American citizens or American rebels." * * *

"I therefore propose, as an additional resolution, applicable to the Rio del Norte boundary only—the one which I will read and send to the Secretary's table, and

on which, at the proper time, I shall ask the vote of the Senate. This is the resolution :

Resolved, *That the incorporation of the left bank of the Rio del Norte into the American Union, by virtue of a treaty with Texas, comprehending, as the said incorporation would do, a part of the Mexican departments of New Mexico, Chihuahua, Coahuila and Tamaulipas, would be AN ACT OF DIRECT AGGRESSION ON MEXICO; for all the consequences of which the United States would stand responsible."*

After a long and animated discussion, notwithstanding the strenuous efforts of the slave-breeders to prevent such a catastrophe, the treaty was rejected by a decisive majority, and there the matter rested with the Government until the next session of Congress, which was only five or six months in the future. Every moment of this time was occupied with the most incessant and systematic drilling by the conspirators. Meetings were held in various sections of the South, in favor of immediate annexation, at which it was bravely determined to *dissolve the Union*, if that measure was not speedily accomplished. The following are specimens of "democratic" sentiments, given at public political dinners in South Carolina.

"At Three Mile Creek, Barnwell District, by C. C. HAY: The re-annexation of Texas to the United States: We will obtain it 'peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must.'

By Jos. G. W. W. DUNCAN: A just reduction of the tariff; the noise of abolition silenced; Texas or disunion; and such legislation as will in future secure the homestead of every family—Polk and Dallas our Presidents.

At Piedmont, Sumter District, by H. E. L. PEEBLES: The annexation of Texas—a measure beneficial to the whole Union, but essential to the safety of the South—at the next session of Congress, we demand Texas or disunion.

At Walterborough. 'Annexation:' The great measure of deliverance and liberty to the South: with it we are

Unionists; *without it, we are disunionists, though the fate of traitors be our doom.* (Nine times nine cheers.)

At Orangeburg Court House, by Gen. D. F. JAMISON :
The Union and Texas, or *Texas and disunion*—Let the opponents of this great American measure accept the alternative.

By Mr. JOHN GOALSON : Texas and South Carolina forever.

By Lieut. JOHN C. ROWE. The annexation of Texas—peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must.”

Although similar sentiments were as courageously uttered throughout the South, we will not burden the reader by inserting more.

We have clearly shown, that the sole object of the slave-holders in the acquisition of Texas, (and we shall soon show that they never meant to be content with bare-ly getting that,) was, to add new securities to their infernal system. As the treaty-making power had stood in the way of the immediate accomplishment of this scheme, the first step taken was, an open, undisguised and successful attempt to over-ride and trample it under foot. Almost simultaneously, “Joint Resolves” were introduced into both houses of Congress, for the annexation of Texas. Thus doing by bare majority, what, if done at all, could only be done constitutionally, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senate. But, is it strange that they who make merchandise of their fellow men, turning them into goods and chattels, should be unrestrained by the forms of law? On the 10th of December, 1844, George Mc. Duffie of South Carolina introduced to the Senate joint resolutions for the annexation of Texas.

The day after the introduction of Mc.Duffie’s resolution in the Senate, on the 11th of December, Mr. Benton of Missouri, who knew that the adoption of that resolve would involve the country in a war with Mexico, and

wishing to avert such a calamity, introduced his counter project, in the shape of

A bill to provide for the annexation of Texas to the United States, as follows :—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled,
That the President of the United States be, and hereby is authorized and advised to open negotiations with Mexico and Texas, for the adjustment of boundaries, and the annexation of the latter to the United States, on the following bases, to wit :

I. The boundary of the annexed territory to be in the desert prairie west of the Neuces, and along the highlands and mountain heights which divide the waters of the Mississippi from the waters of the Rio del Norte, and to latitude forty-two degrees north.

II. The people of Texas, by a legislative act, or by any authentic act which shows the will of the majority, to express their assent to said annexation.

III. A State, to be called '*the State of Texas,*' with boundaries fixed by herself, and an extent not exceeding that of the largest State in the Union, be admitted into the Union, by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the original States.

IV. The remainder of the annexed territories are to be called '*the South-west Territory.*'

V. The existence of slavery to be forever prohibited in the northern and north-western part of said territory, west of the 100th degree of longitude west from Greenwich, so as to divide, as equally as may be, the whole of the annexed country between slave-holding and non-slave-holding States.

VI. The assent of Mexico to be obtained by treaty to such annexation and boundary, or to be dispensed with when the Congress of the United States may deem such assent to be unnecessary.

VII. Other details of the annexation to be adjusted by treaty, so far as the same may come within the scope of the treaty-making power."

But this plan of Benton's was altogether too peaceful ; it was not aggressive enough. It gave the slave-holders

nothing but Texas, with the consent of Mexico; while they had long been determined to have, not only Texas, New Mexico and California, but as much more of that republic as they could get, without her consent. War may not have been their primary object; it probably was not; but they did not care to avoid it, they rather courted it; for they had firmly resolved to take possession of Texas, and as much more of Mexico as they wanted, peacefully, if she did not resist, but forcibly, if she did. The Mexican minister had repeatedly warned this government, that the annexation of Texas would be regarded by his government as a declaration of war; which was a very welcome announcement to the slave-breeders, as furnishing a grand pretext for plundering Mexico of her territory.

But these resolves and this bill did not go far enough; nor did the treaty. They only provided for the annexation of Texas as a *territory*: and a territory could not vote; and *slave votes* were wanted in Congress, as well as more slave territory in the nation: and neither John Tyler nor Mc. Duffie had made any provisions for the votes, nor had Calhoun. And after various modifications and amendments had been offered and rejected, Milton Brown of Tennessee, presented a 'Joint Resolution' in the House, which was adopted Jan. 25, 1845, "declaring the terms on which Congress will admit Texas, as one of the States of this Union;" the first of which is as follows:—

"*Be it resolved*, That Congress doth consent that the territory properly included with, and rightfully belonging to the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a new State to be called the State of Texas; with a republican form of government to be adopted by the people of said Republic, by deputies in convention assembled with the consent of the existing government, in order that the same may be admitted as one of the States of the Union.

And be it further resolved, That the foregoing consent

of Congress is given upon the following conditions, and with the following guaranties, to wit:—

1. Said state to be formed subject to the adjustment by this government of *all questions of boundary* that may arise with other governments; and that the constitution thereof, with the proper evidence of its adoption by the Republic of Texas, shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to be laid before Congress for its final action, on or before the 1st day of January, 1846.

The Texians, “nothing loth,” made haste to accept this offer. Their “*republican form of government*,” was already established, and “the constitution thereof, with the proper evidence of its adoption by the people,” was all ready to be sent to Congress, to be ratified by that body as soon as it had come together. To satisfy the reader that this instrument was all that even a slave-holding Congress could desire, we here give two sections of the

TEXAS CONSTITUTION.

“SEC. 9. All persons of color, who were slaves for life previous to their emigration to Texas, and who *are now held in bondage*, shall remain in the like state of servitude, provided the said slave shall be the bona fide property of the person so holding said slave as aforesaid, Congress shall pass no laws to prohibit emigrants from the United States of America from bringing their slaves into the Republic with them, and holding them by the same tenure by which such slaves were held in the United States; nor shall Congress have the power to emancipate slaves; nor shall any slave-holder be allowed to emancipate his or her slave or slaves, without the consent of Congress, unless he or she shall send his or her slave or slaves without the limits of the republic. No free person of African descent, either in whole or in part, shall be permitted to reside permanently in the republic, without the consent of Congress; and the importation or admission of Africans or negroes into this republic, *excepting from the United States of America*, is for ever prohibited, and declared to be piracy.

SEC. 10. All persons, (*Africans, and the descendants of Africans, and Indians excepted,*) who were residing in Texas on the day of the Declaration of Independence, [a great portion of the *native Mexican citizens* are of course *excluded,*] shall be considered citizens of the republic, and entitled to all the privileges of such."

Soon after the assembling of Congress in December, 1845, the subject of admitting Texas as a State of the Union became the absorbing question in the deliberations of that body. Another "Joint Resolution for the admission of Texas into the American Union," was read on the 16th. Mr. McConnell of Alabama moved the previous question, thus gagging the feeble opposition that might have been made, and the resolves were adopted by a vote of 141 to 56. They were then sent to the Senate, and adopted in that body on the 22d of December, by a vote of 31 to 13. They soon received the signature of the President, and this step in the proceedings was accomplished. The next was to commence hostilities upon Mexico for the purpose of robbing her of New Mexico, California, and the adjacent countries; for as yet, although she had withdrawn her Minister from this country, she had made no other hostile demonstrations;—not even upon Texas.

The Government of this country, which was forever whining and carping about the "grasping ambition of England," had long had an "evil eye" towards these possessions of its neighbor, and Captain Freemont had already been engaged for several years past on a military "*exploring expedition*" in the upper provinces of Mexico, brilliant reports of which he had from time to time communicated to Congress.* So that the plan of opera-

* House Doc. 166, 29th Congress.

tions in that quarter was doubtless already fully digested.

To those who are so ignorant of the character of this government as to suppose that the refusal of Mexico to make indemnity for spoliations on American commerce was one of the causes of the war, it may be necessary to make a few explanations. That Mexico had acknowledged the justice of the claims, and was doing the best she could to liquidate them, as fast as they were adjudicated, until the Americans made war upon her, we have the confession of both Tyler and Polk. In President Tyler's Message of December 1843, he says :—

“The instalments on the claims recently settled by the Convention with Mexico have been *punctually* paid as they have fallen due, and our minister is engaged in urging the establishment of a new Commission in pursuance of the Convention for the settlement of unadjusted claims.”

In the annual message of Mr. Polk, of 1845, he says :

“The interest due on the thirtieth day of April, 1843, and the first three of twenty instalments have been paid.”

“The claims which were left undecided by the joint Commission, amounting to more than \$3,000,000, together with other claims for spoliations on the property of our citizens, were subsequently presented to the Mexican Government for payment, and were so far recognized, that a treaty, providing for their examination and settlement by a joint commission, was concluded and signed at Mexico, on the twentieth day of November, 1843.”

The reader is requested not to forget, that this James K. Polk, who in one breath charges the Mexicans with want of faith in refusing to pay their debts, and in the next takes it all back by admitting that they do pay them as fast as they are able—is the President of *repudiating States*; and that he is the same James K. Polk, who, no

longer ago than August 8, 1846, vetoed a bill for the payment of claims due from the government of the United States to many of her citizens, on account of French spoliations: he wanting the money to hire assassins with which to butcher the innocent Mexicans, for the purpose of forcing them to surrender up more of their territory.*

The army under General Taylor, which at the commencement of the negotiations was located on the Sabine, had long since been moved to the extreme frontiers of Texas, and posted at Corpus Christi on the west bank of the River Nueces in the state of Tamaulipas, where the Texans had established a custom house. There it remained, watching the progress of events, waiting for further developements and further orders. During this period it was called "*the army of occupation.*" Although this army had actually invaded Mexico by entering Tamaulipas, the Mexicans had thus far forbore to make any resistance.

The following extracts from letters of instruction to General Taylor, from the war department, will throw some light on his position between the Nueces and the Rio Grande :—

“WAR DEPARTMENT, July 8, 1845.

Sir : This department is informed that Mexico has some military establishments on the *east side of the Rio Grande*, which are, and for some time have been, in the *actual occupancy of her troops*. In carrying out the instructions heretofore received, you *will be careful to avoid any acts of aggression unless an actual state of war should exist*. The Mexican forces at the posts in their possession, and which have been so, *will not be disturbed as long as the relations of peace between the United States and Mexico continue*.

WM. L. MARCY.

Brig. Gen. Z. Taylor.”

* See his Veto Message of the above date.

On the 30th of the same month, he writes as follows :

“The Rio Grande is claimed to be the boundary between the two countries, and up to this boundary you are to extend your protection, only excepting any posts on the eastern side thereof, which are in the actual occupancy of Mexican forces, or Mexican settlements over which the Republic of Texas did not exercise jurisdiction at the period of annexation, or shortly before that event.”

We have already stated that the Rio Grande was claimed as the western boundary of Texas, and also the fallacy of that claim. Here, the Secretary of War plainly admits that the country to the east of that river is in the occupancy of the Mexicans. That they have “posts,” “forces,” and “settlements” there. And yet General Taylor is instructed by the *War Department*, “not to disturb them.” What is this but an admission that this territory belonged to Mexico. It is true that in 1836 the Texan Congress *resolved* that their western boundary was the Rio Grande. Suppose that the legislature of New York had at the same time resolved that their eastern boundary was the Connecticut River, and should send a gang of marauders to Northampton, and another to Hartford, for the purpose of taking possession of the country, and they should be all captured, hand-cuffed and marched off to jail; why, according to the logic of certain *American Statesmen*, that would entitle New York to the whole of Vermont, a large portion of Massachusetts, and the biggest half of Connecticut. These men knew full well that the Rio Grande was not the boundary between Texas and Mexico, and they dared not all at once assume it as such; else, why suffer those foreign “military establishments,” to remain unmolested?

“If the territory was ours, those would and should have been the first and only objects of attack. What! foreign fortresses and forces on American soil, and American sol-

diers ordered by an American President not to molest them! What did this mean? It meant that the territory was not ours. It meant invasion, war, and a **NEW CONQUEST**, accompanied by the aggravating circumstance of pretending that it was peace!"

All this time our government was affecting to be very "peaceably inclined," by offering to send a minister to Mexico to negotiate a settlement of all existing differences; and although the government of that republic had steadily and firmly refused to receive any but a special commissioner, on the 10th of November, 1845, Mr. Polk commissioned John Slidell of Louisiana, as an "Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Mexico, clothed with *full powers* to adjust and *definitely settle* all pending differences between the two countries, including those of *boundary between Mexico and the State of Texas.*"*

Mexico was not aware that she had any such "boundary question!" to settle. But the United States, after having robbed her of an immense amount of her territory, generously offered to send her a *Minister*, to define the extent of the robbery. This she justly regarded as the highest insult, and refused to negotiate on the subject.

While the American troops were located at Corpus Christi, various reports were circulated through the country, of Mexican preparations to invade Texas. The following extracts from various official despatches of General Taylor to the war department, will enable the reader to set a proper value upon these rumors. These letters are all dated at Corpus Christi.

August 15, 1845, he writes as follows:—

"Nor do I fear that the reported concentration of troops at Matamoras is for any purpose of invasion."

* Polk's Annual Message, Dec. 1845.

August 20, he writes :

"Canavens of traders arrive occasionally from the Rio Grande, but bring no news of importance. They represent that there are no regular troops on that river, except at Matamoras, and do not seem to be aware of any preparations for a demonstration on this bank of the river."

September 6, he writes:—

"I have the honor to report that a confidential agent despatched some days since to Matamoras, has returned, and reports that no extraordinary preparations are going forward there."

Oct. 4, 1845, Gen. Taylor writes :

"Mexico having as yet made no positive declaration of war, or committed any overt act of hostilities, I do not feel at liberty, under my instructions, particularly those of July 8th to make a forward movement to the Rio Grande, without authority from the War Department."

October 11, he says :

"Recent arrivals from the Rio Grande bring no news of a different aspect from what I reported in my last."

January 7, 1846, he writes :

"A recent scout of volunteers from San Antonio struck the river near Presidio, Rio Grande, and the commander reports everything quiet in that quarter."

February 16, he writes :

"Many reports will doubtless reach the department, giving exaggerated accounts of Mexican preparations to resist our advance, if not indeed to attempt an invasion of Texas. Such reports have been circulated even at this place, and owe their origin to personal interests connected with the stay of the army here. *I trust that they will receive no attention at the War Department.*"

Here General Taylor himself declares that these reports were altogether groundless, and cautions the War Department not to give them any attention.

It has already been stated, that as soon as Texas was annexed, the Mexican minister demanded his passports and returned home. The friendly relations of the two governments having been thus interrupted, their diplomatic relations were suspended. Yet Mexico was still willing to receive a special Commissioner to treat upon the causes of that suspension; not to settle a "boundary question," for she had none to settle. Besides, had such a question existed, the United States themselves were not then ready to settle it, as we shall presently show. The Rio Grande was not the "western boundary" of California, nor the Southern; and among other regions of the globe, California was to be acquired yet. It had been "explored" already.*

When John Slidell had received his instructions from James K. Polk, the head kidnapper of the nation, he took his departure for Mexico. On arriving there, that government refused to treat with him, for reasons which have been explained. General Taylor, it will be remembered, was at Corpus Christi with his "dogs of war," ready to let them slip the moment the word of command was given at Washington. As Slidell did not succeed in drawing Mexico into a negotiation, either for the adjustment of the *boundary question*—which was no question—the payment of "claims," or the surrender of the Californias, he began to urge upon his government a resort to extreme measures. On the 27th of December, 1845, he wrote to Mr. Buchanan, Secretary of State, as follows :

"The desire of our government to secure peace, will be mistaken for timidity; the most extravagant pretensions will be made and insisted upon, until the Mexican people shall be convinced by *hostile demonstrations* that our differences must be settled promptly, either by negotiation or by the sword."

* See Report of Captain Fremont, Doc.166, 29th Congress.

The government was not long in improving upon this hint, for in about two weeks after the date of this letter, which must have been immediately after its receipt, the "hostile démonstrations" were made. On the 13th of Jan. 1846, General Taylor was ordered to move forward to the Rio Grande. He accordingly took possession of the Mexican custom house at Bassos Santiago, invested the town with a military force, fortified Point Isabel, and planted his batteries in front of the city of Matamoras. When these preparations were nearly completed, General Taylor wrote to the Adjutant General, April 6, 1846, as follows:—

"On our side, a battery for four 18 pounders will be completed, and the guns placed in battery to-day. *These guns bear directly upon the public square of Matamoras, and within good range for demolishing the town.*"

On the 15th of April, General Taylor informed the department, that "*no hostile movement had then been made by the Mexicans.*" Four days after, an officer in the army wrote to the editor of the Philadelphia Spirit of the Times, as follows:—

"*Camp, opposite Matamoras, April 19, 1846.*

"Our situation here is an extraordinary one. Right in the enemy's country, actually occupying their corn and cotton fields, the people of the soil leaving their homes, and we, with a small handfull of men, marching, with colors flying and drums beating, right under the very guns of one of their principal cities, displaying the star spangled banner, as if in defiance, under their very nose; and they, with an army twice our size at least, sit quietly down, and make not the least resistance—not the first effort to drive the invaders off. There is no parallel to it."

The next letter of General Taylor, is dated April 23, 1846, in which he says:—

“ With a view to check the depredations of small parties of Mexicans on the side of this river, Lieutenants Dobbin, 3d infantry, and Porter, of the 4th infantry, were authorized by me a few days since to scour the country for some miles, with a select party of men, and **CAPTURE OR DESTROY any such parties as they might meet.** It appears that they separated, and that Lieut. Porter, at the head of his own detachment, *surprised a Mexican Camp, drove away the men, and took possession of there horses.*”

Now compare the facts with these statements of James K. Polk, in his last annual message, in which he says:—

“ The existing war with Mexico was neither desired nor provoked by the United States. On the contrary, all honorable means were resorted to, to avert it.”

Fraud and robbery have always been regarded as “honorable means,” by slave-holders, whenever they wished to coerce submission to their demands; and as to “averting” the war, neither Polk or the nation ever had any such desire, as all the facts above detailed clearly demonstrate.

“ On the 26th April, Gen. Taylor again writes: ‘ I regret to report that a party of dragoons, sent out by me on the 24th instant to watch the course of the river above on this bank, *became engaged with a very large force of the enemy,* and after a short affair, in which some sixteen were killed and wounded, appear to have been surrounded and compelled to surrender.’ He further adds: “ *Hostilities may now be considered as commenced.*” For thus attacking a superior force of Mexicans without orders, we are informed that Captain Thornton, who commanded the dragoons, was arrested and tried by a court-martial and the record of that proceeding may now be found in the War Department.”*

As soon as the news of this affair reached Washington, the President sent a message to Congress, declaring that a state of war existed “ *by the act of Mexico.*” This stu-

* Speech of J. R. Giddings, H. R., Dec. 1846.

pendous lie was immediately adopted by that body, and entered on its records. On the 11th of May, 1846, a bill with a preamble containing this brazen falsehood, was adopted in the House, by a vote of 174 to 14.

“James K. Polk, boasted in his first annual Message, that

‘This accession to our territory has been A BLOODLESS achievement. No arm of force has been raised to produce the result. The sword has no part in the victory.’

“Now for a bloody commentary !”

A few days before the passage of this bill, two battles were fought, on the 8th and 9th of May, at Palo Alto and Resaca De La Palma, in which the Mexicans were routed with great slaughter ; the Americans murdering them three to one. Not long afterwards Matamoras was fired upon by the batteries on the opposite side of the river, and was compelled to surrender to the plundering invaders. Other towns and cities soon shared a similar fate. Among which was Santa Fe, the capital of New Mexico. On taking possession of this place, General Kearney issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of this province, absolving them from all allegiance to the government of Mexico, and transferring their allegiance to the nation which was sacking their towns and murdering their brethren ; thus converting them at a dash into American citizens ;—a rare and novel mode of naturalization. As this document is so full of cool impudence, and barefaced villany ; and as it throws additional light on the designs of the government, we give some extracts.

PROCLAMATION.—*To the inhabitants of New Mexico, by Brigadier General S. W. Kearney, commanding the troops of the United States of America.*”

“As by the act of the Republic of Mexico a state of war exists between that Government and the United States,

and as the undersigned, at the head of his troops, on the 18th instant, took possession of Santa Fe, the capital of the Department of New Mexico, he now announces his intention of holding the Department with its original boundaries, (on both sides of the Del Norte,) *as a part of the United States*, and under the name of the Territory of New Mexico."

"The undersigned has instructions from his government to require of those who have left their homes, and taken up arms against the United States, to return forthwith to them, or else they will be considered as enemies and TRAITORS, subjecting their persons to punishment, and their property to *seizure and confiscation* for the benefit of the public treasury. *It is the wish and intention of the United States to provide for New Mexico a free Government*, with the least possible delay, similar to those in the United States."

"The undersigned hereby *absolves all persons residing within the boundary of New Mexico, from all further allegiance to the Republic of Mexico, and hereby claims them as citizens of the United States*. Those who remain quiet and peaceable will be considered as good citizens, and receive protection. Those who are found in arms, or instigating others against the United States, will be considered as TRAITORS, and treated accordingly."

About the same time Monterey on the Pacific, the capital of California, fell a prey to the American squadron under Comodore Sloat, who issued a similar proclamation to the inhabitants of that region, declaring that if they did not lay down their arms, put their necks under the yoke, and consent to be *naturalized*, they would be regarded as TRAITORS, and dealt with accordingly.

General Taylor had already issued his proclamation, not to a single State however, but to the whole of Mexico, calling on the people to forsake their rules, and come under the loving protection of the United States. Some extracts from this extraordinary document are here given :—

"A PROCLAMATION,—By the General Commanding the Army of the United States of America: To the people of Mexico."

"Your army and rulers extort from the people by greivous taxation, by forced loans and military seizures, the very money which sustains the usurpers in power. Being disarmed, *you were left defenceless, an easy prey to the savage Camanches*, who not only destroy your lives and property, but drive into a captivity more horrible than death itself, your wives and children. It is your military rulers who have reduced you to this deplorable condition."

"It is these tyrants, and their corrupt and cruel satellites, gorged with the people's treasure, by whom you are thus oppressed and impoverished."

"It is our wish to see you liberated from despots—to drive back the savage Camanches—to prevent the renewal of their assaults, and to compel them to restore to you from captivity your long lost wives and children. Your religion, your altars and churches, the property of your churches and citizens, the emblems of your faith and its ministers, shall be protected and remain inviolate."

"We come among the people of Mexico as friends and republican brethren, and all who receive us as such shall be protected, whilst all who are seduced into the army of your dictator shall be treated as enemies."

"It is the settled policy of your tyrants to deceive you in regard to the policy and character of our government and people."

"These tyrants fear the example of *our free institutions*, and constantly endeavor to misrepresent our purposes, and inspire you with hatred for your republican brethren of the American Union. Give us but the opportunity to undeceive you, and you will soon learn that all the representations of Paredes were false, and were only made to induce you to consent to the establishment of a despotic government."

"Success on the part of your tyrants against the army of the Union is impossible; but if they could succeed, it would only be to enable them to fill your towns with their soldiers, eating out your substance, and harrassing you with still more greivous taxation.

Mexicans we must treat as enemies, and overthrow the tyrants who, while they have wronged and insulted us, have deprived you of your liberty, but the Mexican people who remain neutral during the contest, *shall be protected* against their military despots by the republican army of the Union.

Z. TAYLOR,
Major General U. S. A. Commanding."

Oh! how the breasts of this "bloody and deceitful man" did overflow with the milk of human kindness towards these poor Mexicans, who were cursed with such bad rulers. His "proclamation," is full of "honed words and fair speeches." We shall soon see what they were worth.

On the 19th of September the city of Monterey, the capital of New Leon, was besieged by a strong force under this same Z. Taylor; and after three days of hard fighting, it was taken by storm.

The bloodiest annals of the Old World hardly furnish a parallel to this battle, in comparison with the numbers engaged. The carnage was truly frightful. The population of the city was about twelve thousand; large numbers of whom, particularly the females, had doubtless remained "neutral during the contest." And now for General Taylor's "protection."

The Monterey Correspondent of the Charleston Mercury says:—

"We are sorry to say, at the close of this rambling letter, that the General of the victorious division, apparently for the sake of popularity, sullied his fair fame by neglecting, for some time after the capitulation, to restrain the passions of the volunteers. The Guards were prohibited from sending out patrols to preserve order and quiet in the city, and as a matter of course, the foul spirit was not long in developing itself. As at Metamoras, MURDER, ROB-

BERY AND RAPE were committed in the broad light of day, and as if desirous to signalize themselves at Monterey by some new act of atrocity, they burned many of the thatched huts of the poor peasants. It is thought that more than one hundred of the inhabitants were murdered in cold blood, and one Mexican soldier, with Gen. Worth's passport in his pocket, was shot dead at noon day in the main street of the city, by a ruffian from Texas. But for the moral influence and the finally exerted physical force of 'the hirelings of Government,' the dark deeds of Badajoz would have been repeated in Monterey. Guards of 'mercenaries' are now placed in every street and over every building in the city to prevent depredations being committed by those who come here from devotion to the land of the free and the home of the brave."

"The Mexicans themselves admit that before the arrival of the volunteers upon the Rio Grande, all Eastern Mexico was ripe for revolt and annexation to the United States. Now there is no portion of the country so bitterly hostile to us and our institutions. We have before us a Monterey paper of July, which reminds the disaffected of the atrocities committed at Metamoras, and adds that the volunteers, the most unprincipled and ungovernable class at home, have been let loose like blood-hounds upon Mexico. We fear that very soon there will be kindled a burning hatred toward us, which will make the timid Mexicans rally from every city, village, and rancho around the banner of their country, and fight with a courage and constancy worthy the descendants of those renowned heroes who conquered the fairest portion of America."

There's "protection" with a vengeance! "As at Metamoras, MURDER, ROBBERY, and RAPE, were committed *in the broad light of day!*"

For those who might think this statement somewhat exaggerated, we give the following as a proof. The army correspondent of the New Orleans Picayune, Mr. Haile, writing from near Mier, (Mexico,) Jan. 4, 1847, says:—

"Below Mier, we met the 2d regiment of Indiana troops, commanded, I believe, by Col. Drake. They en-

camped near our camp, and a portion of them were exceedingly irregular in their behavior, firing away their cartridges, and persecuting the Mexican families at a *ranch* near by."

"On arriving at Mier, we learned from indisputable authority that this same regiment had committed the day before outrages against the citizens of the most disgraceful character;—stealing, or rather *robbing*, insulting the women, breaking into houses, and other feats of a similar character! We have heard of them at almost every *ranch*, up to this place.

Gen. Taylor has issued proclamations assuring the inhabitants of the towns in the conquered territory that they should be protected and well treated by our troops. Since this place has been garrisoned by volunteers, the families have been subjected to all kinds of outrages. At Punta Aguda it has been the same; most of those who could go, have left their houses. Some have fallen into the hands of the Camanches, whilst flying from the persecutions of our volunteer troops. Recently the troops here have received treatment from men stationed here, (I do not know who *commands* them) that negroes in a state of insurrection would hardly be guilty of. *The women have been repeatedly violated*—(almost an every-day affair,) houses are broken open, and insults of every kind have been offered to those whom we are bound by honor to protect. This is nothing more than a statement of facts. I have no time to make comments, but I desire to have this published, and I have written it under the approval of Capt. Thornton, Maj. Dix, (who has in charge \$250,000 of the United States money,) Capt. De Hart, Col. Bohlen, Lt. Thorn, Mr. Blanchard, and my own sense of duty, and I am determined, hereafter, to notice every serious offence of the above mentioned nature."

"The American arms shall not be disgraced without the stigma falling on the guilty parties, if I can be instrumental in exposing them. It would be criminal in me to overlook these outrages, and for the national honor, as well as for that of the United States Army, I shall not do so."

The *Austin (Texas) Democrat*, as quoted by the *Bos-*

ton Post, a paper which has always strenuously advocated both *annexation* and *war*, says:—

“David Horsely, in Capt. Chandler’s company of *Texan volunteers*, had been found murdered in an orange grove, and dragged to the San Juan. “The news spread like wild-fire among *Hay’s* men. [*Hay’s* regiment had been disbanded for disorderly conduct.] They determined to take ample vengeance. Wo to the Mexican falling in their way! Gen. Worth was made acquainted with what was going forward; he sent his aid to *expostulate* and *beg* of the *Texans to cease*. Infuriated by the cowardly meanness of the *murderers* of their fellow-soldier, **THEY SPARED NOT A MAN! IT IS THOUGHT EIGHTY OR ONE HUNDRED MEXICANS FELL TO AVENGE THE DEATH OF HORSELY!!** Terrible retribution! Gen. Taylor was induced to order all disbanded troops, such was the excitement, to leave Monterey in forty-eight hours.”

The Monterey paper, quoted by the correspondent of the *Mercury*, does not represent truly in saying that “the most unprincipled and ungovernable class at home have been let loose like blood hounds upon Mexico; for the most “*unprincipled and ungovernable*” class of men stay at home to rule the nation. These *volunteers* are their *dupes and tools*. It takes such men to commit such deeds. And yet they are the men of the people’s choice; and they fairly represent the people. These brutal soldiers, who are thus murdering peaceful men and ravishing helpless women—who are robbing the poor and needy, and burning their humble dwellings, are the chosen and commissioned agents of the American people. And in committing crimes which would shame a gang of Algerine pirates, they pass unrebuked by their principals. And yet these men call themselves christians; and will denounce the man as an infidel, who says they are not. But how terrible is the sarcasm of Tristram Burgess, when he says:—“they needs must be

christians; for there is no other religion which has in itself a fund of redeeming mercy, sufficient for the perilous desperateness of their condition."

The most sunken in infamy, cannot deny that these are **CRIMES**. We will now take a glimpse at some of the **HORRORS** of this slave-holding war.

The Baltimore correspondent of the True Sun gives the following particulars of the attack on Tobasco, by the American squadron.

"A great many defenceless females and children were unfortunately killed by the shells from our guns. An instance or two is mentioned. A Mexican had his only daughter, a beautiful girl of eighteen years, completely cut in two by a twenty-four pound shot, and after laying the mutilated remains on the bed, he rushed down to the beach, covered with blood, and implored our men to stop firing. In another instance, a whole family were sitting at the table, when a shell fell among them, instantly exploding, killing all the females, besides three servants."

The following is an extract from a letter addressed to the Louisville Courier, dated, Monterey, Oct. 17, 1847:—

"While I was stationed with our left wing in one of the forts, on the evening of the 21st, I saw a Mexican woman busily engaged in carrying bread and water to the wounded men of both armies. I saw this ministering angel raise the head of a wounded man, give him water and food, and then bind up his ghastly wound with a handkerchief she took from her own head. After having exhausted her supplies, she went back to her house to get more bread and water for others. As she was returning on her mission of mercy, to comfort other wounded persons, I heard the report of a gun, and saw the poor innocent creature fall dead! I think it was an accidental shot that struck her. I would not be willing to believe otherwise. It made me sick at heart, and turning from the scene, I involuntarily raised my eyes toward heaven, and thought, great God! is this war? Passing the spot the next day, I saw her body still lying there, with the bread by her side, and the broken

gourd, with a few drops of water still in it--emblems of her errand. We buried her, and while we were digging her grave, cannon balls flew around us like hail."

Why the writer should think it was "an accidental shot," that struck this "ministering angel," we cannot conceive. For she was doing precisely what the American people have declared to be a *crime worthy of death*--she was giving "aid and comfort to the enemy."

A young soldier named Wynkoop, of Zanesville, Ohio, who was in the fight at Monterey, writes home to his friends as follows:—

"During the fight of the second day, a flag of cessation was sent to the Mexicans, requesting a few hours to bury the dead which were strewed in frightful piles over the field. This was refused, and the wounded and dead lay where they fell, beneath the rays of a scorching sun till the battle was ended. It was then almost impossible for our men to endure the stench, while they heaped dirt over the poor fellows where they lay. The bodies of the dead were as black as coals; many of them were stripped of their clothing by the Mexicans during the night. Several of those who were wounded during the first day's fight, crawled into ditches and holes to avoid the balls which were rolling like hail-stones over the field, whence, exhausted, by the loss of blood, they were unable to crawl, or give signs of distress. As a consequence, many perished, though some who were found in this condition were removed, and are recovering."—*Zanesville Whig*.

A Volunteer in the Kentucky regiment, (Rowan Hardin) writing to his father, after the battle of Monterey, gives an account of the three days' fighting. He says:—

On Monday night the Mexicans were in high spirits. They had lost but few men. All night they threw up sky-rockets. At night the firing ceased. The left wing of the Kentucky regiment, to which I am attached, were marched into the fort taken by us, to hold it during the night. As we moved in, we were in point blank shot of one battery, and raked on our right by another. They

both belched fire the whole time we were marching in, a distance of one mile. Such a night as I spent that night, I hope never to spend again. We had eaten nothing since daylight. We had no shelter—no food—no fire. We laid down in the mire and blood, among dead men and horses, and a cold rain fell on us all night. I had no coat on, having gone into the fight in my shirt-sleeves.

I never heard balls whistle before. Two cannon balls passed within two feet of me, and many more within a short distance.

The dead men were awful sights to look upon, some shot with cannon balls, and some with small shot—some with their heads shot off—some with their legs off—some with their bowels scattered on the ground. We had no time until yesterday to bury the dead. The heavens were filled with carrion birds, and the air with stench. I have not time to write at large—am in fine health, unhurt, without a scratch, for which I am truly thankful.”

A letter from Monterey, from James A. Jackson, a Washington volunteer, in the Baltimore Battalion, describing the late battle, says:—

“I was almost thirsted to death; and upon casting a disconsolate look around me, I saw a poor fellow lying dead close by. I stooped down to see if there was any water in his canteen, and it was full; I took a drink, and swung the prize to my side. I soon passed another poor fellow, with both legs carried away; he had been thus wounded ever since morning, and was groaning and calling in a very feeble manner for water. I stopped to give him a draught, and he emptied my canteen. I had not got one yard from him, before a grape shot came and cut him in two—throwing little pieces of flesh and blood all over me.”

Extract of a private letter from an officer of Artillery in our Army, dated Monterey, Mexico, October 5, 1846, in the New York Tribune:—

“*My Dear Sir* :—While every body seems to be looking for peace in the United States, we are here obliged to fight battles, and bloody ones too, and after all, the prospect of finishing the business, and getting out of the

country looks any thing but cheering. The feeling of hostility against us is very strong, and it is doubtful if any Administration can sustain itself in any arrangement for a general peace with us.

I was exposed to a most severe fire on the whole of the 21st, and for two or three hours on the 22d, and only had one man killed at my guns, during which time I fired over fifty rounds from each. I am satisfied with glory, if it is to be obtained only by butchering my fellow men; and I wish some of our valorous friends at the North could see a little more of the realities of War, and they would not be so anxious to rush into one on every trivial occasion. It makes me sick now, when I think of the scenes I witnessed. They were perfectly horrid. On the night of the 23d, as our shells exploded in the city, they were followed by the most *terrific cries*, perhaps from *women and children*, which did not cease till morning. Thank God! I only threw two shells that night, on account of being told the Texans were on the roofs of the houses immediately in my line of fire, and as I was about to open in the morning upon the principal *plaza*, which was filled with four thousand troops, I was stopped by the appearance of a flag of truce; and the result was the capitulation of the city, and a suspension of arms for two months; which I *hope* may terminate in a general peace, and that we may be permitted again to see our families."

PALO ALTO--(*Cor. Spirit of the Times.*)

“Major Ringgold received a shot, while seated on his horse, that carried away the flesh on his legs, from his knees up, and passed through the withers of his beautiful thorough-bred charger, ‘David Branch,’ (a frequent winner on the turf.) Captain Page had his lower jaw shot off. The wounds of the men were very severe—most of them requiring amputation of some limb. *The surgeon’s saw was going the live-long night, and the groans of the sufferers were heart-rending.* Too much praise cannot be given to the devotion and prompt action of our medical officers. It was a sad duty for them.

I took advantage of the halt to go over the field of battle. It was a truly shocking sight. Our artillery had literally mowed them down! *There were heaps of dead lying hither and yon, with the most ghastly wounds I ever saw, which made one shudder.* The number of killed could not be accurately ascertained; but of killed and wounded, there must have been at least 800." * *

From a letter published in the Herald.

* * * "At an occasional lull of the war, the shrieks of the wounded and dying could be heard, while artillery and cavalry horses were rushing madly to and fro, some with broken legs, and some in the last agonies of death. * * *

War, while raging in all its fierceness on the field of battle, is a soul-stirring and noble excitement; but after that has passed away, it is sickening and horrible to think of even, much less to be obliged to look upon its ghastly barbarities. I will not freeze your blood by telling you the horrid sights I have seen, the shrieks I have heard, while at the same instant one might see a bacchanalian orgie, and hear the shout of the revellers. I have read many accounts of battles, but never a description of one."

From a correspondent of the Prov. Transcript.

"Our regiment (4th Infantry) was then ordered forward again to support the artillery in a new position which they had taken; as we rose the crest of a small ridge, the whole battery of the enemy was fired at the head of our column. I thought for the moment that my company (the leading one) was all cut down. Capt. Page, who, being in command of the division, was then on the right of the line, was struck down with such force as to carry with him the three men next behind him; his whole lower jaw was shot away, and the ghastly hideousness of his visage, as he reared up in convulsive agony from the grass as we passed him, will not soon vanish from my recollection; another man about in the centre of my company had his head knocked off; the Sergeant on my right

had his musket driven from his hand by a ball which passed between me and the man before me; we were then ordered to retire out of range from the battery.

Duncan's battery manœuvred admirably, and soon began to return the compliment with interest. I don't know anything I have ever heard that sounded so sweet to me as the first discharge from his guns; for the idea that we had to lie there and take it, without being able to strike a blow in our defence, was anything but pleasant.

Our men soon got to laughing and joking, making fun of the balls—except when they hit. Some of the balls we could see coming bounding toward us, which were easily dodged, but I saw several artillery horses killed by them; others came whizzing through the air, which we avoided by lying flat on the ground—others came ripping through the grass, and these told. We had been about a quarter of an hour in this position, when the first and only shot hit my company. It struck in a little squad of men about three feet from me, wounding five men so that one died that night, another had his leg taken off, a third his hip badly injured, and the other two not much hurt, as it just grazed one's head and the other's hand, so as to leave its mark.

We entered the chapporral bush, but before we had gone a dozen yards, we came to a little opening where I saw some of the 'horrors of war' in the shape of eleven dead Mexicans, every one cut and mangled in the most horrible manner that it is possible to conceive of a cannon ball's killing a man. They must have been all killed instantly. Col Belknap ordered a hole to be dug, and had the bodies tumbled in and filled up.

We pursued the poor devils about a quarter of a mile, and then, to my great relief, the command was given for the 6th to halt. We then began to look about us, and see how many of us were left. The ground all around was covered with Mexicans and a few of our men, and also with horses, some dead, others more or less wounded. It was dark by this time, and parties were sent to bring in the wounded, of either side. They did not have to go far for them—they were lying all around us plenty as possible.

An officer who came in yesterday told me that they were

burying the dead. He says he counted 80 bodies that were put into one hole—another officer counted 36 put in another, and when my informant came away, they were digging holes and bringing in bodies as fast as possible. The bushes were full of them. It is said that out of one of their finest regiments, but 26 reached Matamoras.”

A gentleman connected with the U. S. Army on the Rio Grande, in a letter to the Boston Courier, gives the following account of the night which followed the recent battle :

“That night, was to me, a terrible one, which I shall never, never forget : the screams and groans of the wounded and dying, on both sides, mangled and torn as they all were with the grape and six-pounder shots,—the conflagration of the battle-ground, fit emblem of the awful work of death which had so long been going on ; the moans of the poor oxen and horses, so terribly mangled ; and the dreadful uncertainty of the extent of our loss, and how many of our friends who were alive at dinner, were then asleep forever ; the night-work of our surgeons, with their horrible instruments, all besmeared with human blood—were sights and sounds and thoughts, I pray God, in his mercy, may never visit me with again.”

Extract from a letter from an officer of the Army, communicated to the Albany Evening Journal, dated

“FORT BROWN, May 13th, 1845.

I assure you that this battle of the 9th will never be forgotten by any participant—a most closely fought and bloody battle. I saw a corporal who was by my side kill three men, who appeared in the same opening in the thicket, in quick succession—they literally fell dead one upon the other ; he then wounded some others, rushed out and made prisoners of them ; handed them over, and went to work firing again. This man expended 27 cartridges, and I doubt whether he ever missed his aim. The balls fell around us like hail, but yet there were only three or four men that fell near me ; but after the battle was over, oh!

the awful spectacle that ground presented—the wounded and dead literally lying in piles, some groaning, others in the last agonies, others begging in Spanish for a drop of water, and it was exceedingly gratifying to see with what alacrity and kindness our soldiers would give them the last drop in their canteens, and assist them to the place designated for the wounded,

I spent some time after the battle in collecting such wounded men as I could find—among them a Major who was severely wounded—he asked for water, which I gave him, and one of our officers coming up with a little brandy in his canteen, we gave him a drop; he took my hand, and giving me a grateful look, said, ‘thanks, Captain,’ which I presume were the last words he spoke. I saw the poor fellow among the dead on the following day.”

Another writes:—

“There was little sense of a mere personal discomfort, however, on a field covered with slaughter—a scene which I trust in Heaven never to witness again. There lay around me fellow-men, comrades and antagonists, suffering the most horrid anguish: some with an arm off, others with one and some with both legs shattered or severed from the body.

There was one poor fellow, a Mexican, with his belly tore open and a part of his bowels protruded upon the ground; he was still alive, and pointed to his mouth for water; but, alas! in vain, for we had none to give—not even a drop to cool his tongue. He soon after perished, of course.”

An officer of the army writes from Matamoras, under date of May 23d:

“I went over the field after the battle of *Rosaca de la Palma*, and the sight which met my eyes there was one which imagination can scarcely depict. Bodies of Mexican soldiers were lying about in every direction—some with their heads entirely or partly shot off—others without legs or arms—others with their entrails torn out. One man, a fine looking fellow, was lying on the ground with a cartridge in his fingers, having evidently been killed

while in the act of priming his musket. I crept about on my hands and knees through the chapporal, and at every few paces, I would come across dead bodies; and at one spot, I discovered the body of *a beautiful Mexican girl, staked through the heart.*"

This war, so horrid in its details, has been one of terrible mortality to the invaders. Colonel Baker, of the Illinois regiment of volunteers, in a speech in Congress, as reported in the Boston Atlas of Jan. 2, 1847, says:—

"Less than six months ago, Congress had sent into the field as many as twenty-six regiments of volunteers, all burning with the most exalted hopes, and ready to peril their all, health, reputation, life itself, *not in a defensive, but in an invasive war; a war not undertaken to defend their own homes and firesides, but for the glory of the American name and arms.* Alas! how many of these fine young men, who had never seen a battle, never had cast their stern glance on the countenance of an enemy, were now sleeping their last sleep on the banks of the Rio Grande! Once their hearts heaved high with a soldier's fondest hopes; proud and light had been their measured footsteps as they marched in all the buoyancy of youthful ambition. But now—

'Where rolls the rushing Rio Grande,
How peacefully they sleep;
They did not fall in bloody strife,
Upon a well-fought field.
Not from the red wound poured their life,
Where cowering foemen yield.
Th' archangel's shade was slowly cast
Upon each polished brow;
But, calm and fearless to the last,
They sleep securely now.'

The bones of nearly two thousand young men, in whose veins flowed some of the best blood of this country, were now resting in the mould on the banks of the Rio Grande, who never had seen the face of an enemy, and who never had had the opportunity of striking one manly blow in behalf of their country and their race."

Mr. Baker also declares, that this is not a defensive, but an INVASIVE WAR. And horrible and revolting as these crimes are, they are innocence, in comparison with the more enormous crime, for the extension and continuance of which this brutal war has been waged. The blackness of the pit can hardly furnish a parallel to the wickedness of the people, who are thus wading through carnage and blood for the purpose of fastening the yoke of bondage on the necks of unborn millions of their race.

In his last annual message, the President said:—

“This war has not been *waged* with a view to conquest.”

Of course it has not. It has been “waged” “to establish justice; and to secure the blessings of LIBERTY to ourselves and our posterity.” And all this indiscriminate slaughter of men, women and children—this storming and bombarding cities, and giving them up a prey to the lusts of the brutal soldiery, who committed “*rape, robbery, and murder; in the broad light of day*”—was purely accidental, and so are the facts detailed in the following paragraph from the same message:—

“In less than seven months, we have acquired military possession of the Mexican Provinces of New Mexico, New Leon, Coahuila, Tamaulipas, and the Californias, a territory larger in extent than that embraced in the original thirteen States of the Union.

Now that the President was not “a dog,” and that he didn’t mean to “do this thing,” we have his own statement: for he tells us that “all honorable means were resorted to, to avert it.” So he took “possession” of these provinces because he could not help it.

The following letter from the War Department to Col. J. D. Stephenson of New York, taken in connection with

the above paragraph from the message,—the proclamations of Generals Taylor, Kearney, and Commodore Sloat, and all the facts in the case, will illustrate the truth of the statements, that “the war has not been waged with a view to conquest; and that all honorable means were resorted to, to avert it.” The following is the letter:—

“WAR DEPARTMENT, June 26, 1849.

SIR,—The President having determined to send a Regiment of Volunteers around Cape Horn, to the Pacific to be employed in prosecuting hostilities to some province of Mexico, probably in Upper California, has authorized me to say, that if you will organize one on the conditions hereinafter specified, and tender its services, it would be accepted. It is proper that it should be done with the consent of the Governor of New York. The President expects and indeed requires, that great care should be taken to have it composed of suitable persons—I mean of good habits—as far as practicable of various pursuits, *and such as would be likely to remain at the end of the war, either in Oregon or in any other territory in that region of the Globe, which may then be a part of the United States.* The act of the 18th of May authorizes the acceptance of volunteers for twelve months, or during the war with Mexico. The condition of the acceptance, in this case, must be a tender of service during the war, and it must be explicitly understood, that they may be discharged *without a claim for returning home wherever they may be serving at the termination of the war*, providing it is in the THEM territory of the United States, or may be taken to the nearest and most convenient territory belonging to the United States, and there discharged.

The men must be apprised that their term of service is for the war—that they are to be discharged as above specified, and that they are to be employed on distant service. *It is, however, very desirable that it should not be publicly known or proclaimed that they are to go to any particular place.* On this point great caution is enjoined.

The communication to the officers and men must go so far as to remove all just grounds of complaint, that they

have been deceived in the nature and the place of the service.

It is expected that the Regiment will be in readiness to embark as early as the first of August next; if practicable, steps will be immediately taken to provide for transportation.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

W. L. MARCY, Secretary of War.

Col. J. D. STEVENSON, New York City."

The following extracts from the Charleston Courier will throw additional light on the object of the Mexican conquest:—

"Besides, every battle fought in Mexico, and every dollar spent there, but insures the acquisition of territory which must widen the field of Southern enterprise and power in the future, and the final result will be to readjust the whole balance of power in the confederacy, so as to give us control over the operations of the government in all time to come. If the South be true to themselves, the day of our depression is *gone, and gone forever.*"

"If they succeed in restricting Slavery *one inch below the Missouri compromise*, then if we submit to it, we shall deserve our degraded destiny. When this issue is tendered us, let the consequences be what they may, we must meet it as becomes men and freemen. It will be no time to argue. Not that we should care to reserve acquired territory merely as a habitation for slaves, but if they succeed in fixing restrictions against that institution especially, it will be a moral degradation and insult to us, which, if we bear in peace, will make us the fit subjects of Jespotism."

"A combination may be made upon the principle of opposition to the Mexican war upon anti-slavery feelings."

"The first development will be a movement to prohibit the introduction of Slavery into any territory to be acquired in Mexico, and then to restore, to a great extent, the high duties that have been recently abolished. These two points are well calculated to rally the most powerful interests against us, and to give to agitators and demagogues their brightest prospects of triumph."

The war has been, and is now, prosecuted as a war of *aggression and conquest*. And the Americans are still ploughing up the plains of Mexico with the chariot wheels of the war-god, for the purpose of planting on its virgin soil the infernal "*Upas orchards of slavery*." To make this still more evident—if the light is not already too dazzling—we give some extracts from the debates in Congress on the "*Wilmot Proviso*." The President asked Congress to allow him two millions of dollars,—as he pretended—to make peace with. But really, for the purpose of buying slave territory; as he thought it would come cheaper in the end, than fighting for it. So a bill was introduced into that body for this purpose. Upon this bill, Mr. Wilmot of Pennsylvania offered the following Amendment, which was adopted in the house; *all the members from the slave-holding States, with Gen. McKay, who reported the bill, voting against it:—*

"Provided, That, as an express and fundamental condition to the acquisition of any territory from the Republic of Mexico by the United States by virtue of any Treaty which may be negotiated between them, and to the use by the Executive of moneys herein appropriated, *neither Slavery or involuntary servitude shall exist in any part of said territory*, except for crime, whereof the party shall first be duly convicted."

The bill, so amended, went to the Senate, where a motion was made to strike out this hated proviso. Upon this motion it is said, that "a Northern Senator talked it to death." When Congress came together last December, the President, quite as anxious to *make peace* as he had been to *avert the war*,—again asked for more money for this purpose, but as his desires had somewhat enlarged during the recess, he now called for three millions, instead of two. A bill was accordingly introduced for this purpose, by Mr.

Preston King of New York, of which the following is one section —

Sec. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in any territory which shall hereafter be acquired by, or be annexed to the United States, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: *Provided always*, That any person escaping into the same from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the United States, such fugitives may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed out of the territory to the persons claiming his or her labor or service."

Upon this a debate sprung up. Mr. Hillard of Alabama, said :—

"Would the gentleman say he meant to hold all the territory we might acquire, and to exclude Slavery from every part of it? If he did, he would warn that gentleman, that on that question, *this Union could only stand on those compromises* which he regarded in their sacred obligation as second only to the Constitution."

"Gentlemen transcended the rules which should govern them here : if they proceeded, they would rouse a feeling at the South that would rend the bonds of this Union as Samson burst the withes that bound him. Was this the doctrine that was to be acted on, that, acquire what territory we might, free labor might be suffered to go there, but the men of the South should not take their slaves with them there? If this thing was to be done, this Government would be unequal, and its days would be numbered."

Mr. Dargan of Alabama spoke on the same subject ; he said :—

"What was he to infer from this? That it was their purpose to hedge round and limit the South, so that all those who were the owners of slaves should be compelled to stand just where they were now, and never to move a foot in any direction. What, then, would be their condition twenty or twenty-five years hence? None could know, but he was not willing to run the risk of the consequences of any such arrangement."

‘What would be thought by the volunteers from the South, when it was announced to them that *slavery* was to be excluded from the territory their arms had acquired? This question must be settled before we proceed to acquire more territory, for afterwards it will be too late.’

“Mr. D. was not esteemed by his friends a ‘hot Southron;’ on the contrary, he was spoken of by them as rather a cool, considerate man. As a cool man, then, let him tell gentlemen his own candid opinion: unless, in the territory which we might win from Mexico, and add to our own, the principles which had settled the line of thirty-six degrees, thirty minutes, as the compromise line between free and slave territory should be permitted to prevail, *this Union must at once sink.*”

“Say to the South, that they are only fighting to make **FREE TERRITORY**, that it is *only for this* that the brave men of Carolina, Georgia and Alabama are periling their lives, and they will demand the settlement of this question *now*, preliminary to any further prosecution of the war!”

“But if gentlemen were determined to push on, regardless of the principles of compromise, and press them to the wall, let them take the admonition of one who, in all probability, would never address them again, and believe him when he said that if they did that they might from that hour *date the downfall of this Republic.*”

This speech contains a *frank* admission that “the volunteers from the South” are fighting for more *slave territory*, and he asks “what they will think” when told, that after all they are not to have what they are fighting for.

Soon after the reading of this bill another was introduced, providing a territorial government for Oregon; where upon the question of excluding slavery from that territory was raised; and was followed by an animated discussion.

Mr. Toombs, of Georgia said:—

“The South would remain in the Union on a ground of perfect equality with the rest of the Union, or they would not stay at all. No, the people of the South claimed the ought to carry their *institutions* with them wherever they

went ; into all parts of the Republic ; that they had a right to make their own laws while organized as territories and when they became States to choose for themselves whether they would have Slavery or not. That they demanded as their right, and they intended to have it. It was only fair play, and there was no use in blinking the question. They would be degraded, and unworthy of the name of American freemen, could they consent to remain, for a day or an hour, in a Union where they must stand on the ground of inferiority, and be denied the rights and privileges which were extended to all others."

Mr. Leake of Virginia, said:—

"That if the present attempt to impose *limitation with respect to the extension of slavery* should be persisted in, and should prevail, the South must stand in self-defence, for they could not and would not submit to it. He went into a review of the Wilmot proviso—complained of the North for having thrown a firebrand into the House—appealed to their justice and patriotism, and warned them to abandon their crusade against the rights of the South, or they might see, before long, 'the beginning of the end,' but God only could see its termination."

The bill excluding slavery from the conquered territory passed the house by a vote of 115, to 106, and was sent to the Senate. Its appearance in that body caused considerable excitement. In the debates which followed, Mr. Calhoun of South Carolina, said:—

"Sir, there is no mistaking the signs of the times ; and it is high time that the southern States, the slave-holding States, should inquire what is now their relative strength in this Union, and what it will be if this determination should be carried into effect hereafter. Sir, already we are in a minority—I use the word 'we' for brevity sake—already we are in a minority in the other House, in the electoral college, and, I may say, in every department of this government, except at present in the Senate of the United States—there for the present we have an equality. Of the twenty-eight States, fourteen are non-slave-holding and fourteen are slave-holding, counting Delaware, which is doubtful, as one of the non-slave-holding States. But

this equality of strength exists only in the Senate. One of the clerks at my request has furnished me with a statement of what is the relative strength of the two descriptions of States, in the other House of Congress, and in the electoral college. There are 228 representatives, including Iowa, which is already represented there. Of these, 138 are from the non-slave-holding States, and 90 are from what are called the slave States, giving a majority in the aggregate to the former of 48. In the electoral college there are 168 votes belonging to the non-slave-holding States, and 118 to the slave-holding, giving a majority of 50 to the non-slave-holding."

"Now, I ask, is there any remedy? Does the constitution afford any remedy? And if not, is there any hope? These, Mr. President, are solemn questions—not only to us, but, let me say to the gentlemen of the non-slave-holding States, to them. Sir, the day that the balance between the two sections of the country—the slave-holding States and the non-slave-holding States—is destroyed, is a day that will not be far removed from political revolution, anarchy, civil war, and wide-spread disaster. The balance of this system is in the slave-holding States. They are the conservative portion—always have been the conservative portion—always will be the conservative portion; and with a due balance on their part may, for generations to come, uphold this glorious Union of ours. But if this policy should be carried out—if we are to be reduced to a handful—if we are to become a mere ball to play the presidential game with—to count something in the Baltimore caucus—if this is to be the result—wo! wo! I say to this Union!"

The clause, prohibiting the establishment of slavery in the conquered territory was struck out of the "three million bill," by the Senate, and then sent back to the House, for the purpose of giving the slave-holders another opportunity for exercising the rising spirit of liberty from that body. They soon found "dough-faces" enough, whom they so far moulded to their purposes, as to get a

majority in favor of the bill in its amended form, and it was almost immediately adopted.

What the President has done with the money, remains to be seen. The war still rages. Another bloody battle was fought at Buena Vista, between the Americans, under Taylor, and the Mexicans; under Santa Anna; on the 22d of February, which lasted three days; and in which four or five thousand men were murdered, and left weltering in their blood.

On the 27th of March, the city of Vera Cruz, with the Castle of San Juan De Ulloa, surrendered to the combined military and naval forces by which they were surrounded, after being bombarded four days; and after the city was nearly laid in ruins. More than two hundred and thirty tons of cannon balls and bomb shells, were fired into the dwellings and streets of this devoted city. The slaughter was principally among the women and children. The following extracts from the Boston Daily Mail of April 13, 1847, will give the reader some idea of the awful havoc:—

“On the second day of the bombardment an offer was made to surrender the town, but Gen. Scott would not accept the town without the castle, and two days more of bombardment ensued, when the soldiers of the garrison, listening to the entreaties of the suffering inhabitants, compelled the general commanding to surrender both town and castle.”

“The bombardment of four days placed the town in ruins, under which great numbers of non-combatants, men, women and children, were buried.”

“The bombardment is represented to have been terrific, and to its thunders succeeded the moans of the dying in every part of the town for several days afterwards.”

“The destruction in the city is most awful—and half of it is destroyed. Dwellings are blown to pieces and furniture scattered in every direction—the streets torn up, and the strongest buildings seriously damaged.”

A correspondent of the Auburn Daily Advertiser, who was one of the first to enter the city of Vera Cruz, after its surrender, thus describes what he saw :—

“Never had I beheld such destruction of property. Scarcely a house did I pass that did not show some great rent made by the bursting of our bomb shells. At almost every house at which I passed to examine the destruction occasioned by these dreadful messengers of death, some one of the family (if the house did not happen to be deserted) would come to the door, and inviting me to enter, point out their property, and with a piteous sigh exclaim, ‘*La bomba! La bomba!*’ [the bomb! the bomb!] My heart ached for the poor creatures.”

“During my peregrinations, I came to a lofty and noble mansion, in which a terrible bomb had exploded, and laid the whole front of the house in ruins. While I was examining the awful havoc created, a beautiful girl of some seventeen, came to the door and invited me into the house. She pointed to the furniture of the mansion torn into fragments, and the piles of rubbish lying around, and informed me, with her beautiful eyes filled with tears, that the bomb had destroyed her father, mother, brother, and two little sisters, and that she was now left in the world alone! O war! war!—who can tell thy horrors? Who can picture thy deformities?”

“During the afternoon I visited the hospital. Here lay upon truckle beds the mangled creatures who had been wounded during the bombardment. In one corner was a poor, decrepit, bed ridden woman, her head white with the sorrows of 70 years. One of her withered arms had been blown off by a fragment of a shell. In another place might be seen mangled creatures of both sexes, bruised and disfigured by the falling of their houses, and bursting of the shells. On the stone floor lay a child in a complete state of nudity, with one of its poor legs cut off just above the knee. The apartment was filled with flies, that seemed to delight in the agonies of the miserable creatures over whom they hovered, and the moans were heart rending.”

“I went about from cot to cot, and attempted to condole with the sufferers, by whom I was invariably greeted with a kind smile. Not even this abode of wretchedness had

been exempt from the cursed scourge of war! A bomb had descended through the roof, and after landing on the floor exploded, sending some twenty already mangled wretches to 'sleep the sleep that knows no waking.'"

Truly, Slavery, thou art a frightful monster, when thou canst thus butcher the innocent, and fatten the earth with the carcasses of the slain, for the purpose of extending and perpetuating thy terrible, and bloody dominion.

The following article from GENERAL ORDERS, was published with solemn pomp, several days *after the surrender*.

"GENERAL ORDERS, NO. 72.

ARMY HEAD QUARTERS,
Camp Washington, before Vera Cruz, March 28. }

6. The inhabitants of Vera Cruz, and their property, are placed under the safeguard of every *American's honor*; and any miscreant who shall do injury to any persons or property, shall be promptly brought before a military commission, under General Orders No. 20.

By command of Maj. Gen. SCOTT.

(Signed) H. L. SCOTT, Asst. Adt. Adj. Gen. 29th March, 1847."

Does the reader wish to know what sort of a "safeguard," "every American's honor," will afford to the defenceless Mexicans, he is referred to the letter from Monterey, published in the Charleston Mercury—the letter of Mr. Haile to the New Orleans Picayune. The article from the Austin Democrat, &c. on page 94 of this work, and the following extracts from the New Orleans Delta.

In a letter of Major Coffee to the New Orleans Delta, giving an account of the battle of Buena Vista, he says:—

"Some days before the fight, a transaction occurred at Agua Nueva, which called down a severe censure from Gen. Taylor. One of the Arkansas volunteers was lassoed by the ranoheros, and dragged to death amongst the prickly

pears and thorn bushes : his friends heard of it, went out and slaughtered 18 or 20 peons, (half-serfs,) totally unarmed. It was certainly unchristian like, but they kill us when they meet us to disadvantage."

The following extracts from a letter published in the St. Louis Republican, detail the particulars of this bloody transaction.

"CAMP OF THE ARMY OF AGUA NUEVA. }
MEXICO, February 13, 1847. }

"Some most unfortunate events have transpired in our column lately, which will arouse the vengeance of the 'paisanos' in this country against our troops, and will furnish the disaffected at home with new food for vituperation against the war. Occasional murders of our men have been perpetrated ever since we have been in the country—all killed by the lasso. The Arkansas regiment of horse, from their having been employed as scouts, and occupying the outposts, have been particularly exposed to this guerilla warfare, and have lost four or five of their men. The day before yesterday, it was reported that one of their number had been killed by the Mexicans, as he had been missing from camp since the day before, when he went out to look for his horse."

"Search was made for the body, and it was found about a thousand yards from our camp, with a lasso around the neck, and tied to a prickly pear, having been dragged some three hundred yards from the chaparral. It presented a most horrible sight: the name of the young man was Colquitt, a nephew of the Senator. The Arkansas men vowed vengeance deep and sure. Yesterday morning, a number of them, some thirty perhaps, went out to the foot of the mountain, two miles off, to an 'arroyo' which is washed in the side of the mountain, to which the 'paisano' of Agua Nueva had fled upon our approach, and soon commenced *an indiscriminate and bloody massacre of the poor creatures*, who had thus fled to the mountains and fastnesses for security. A number of our regiment being out of camp, I proposed to Col. Bisseil to mount our horses and ride to the scene of carnage, where I knew, from the dark insinuations of the night before, that blood was run-

ning freely. We hastened out as hastily as possible, but owing to the thick chaparrals, the work of death was over before we reached the horrible scene, and the perpetrators were returning to camp glutted with revenge."

"Let us no longer complain of Mexican barbarity—poor, degraded, 'priest ridden' as she is. *No act of inhuman cruelty, perpetrated by her most desperate robbers, can excel the work of yesterday, committed by our soldiery.* God knows how many of the unarmed peasantry have been sacrificed to atone for the blood of poor Colquitt. The Arkansas regiment say not less than thirty have been killed. I think, however, at least twenty of them have been sent to their eternal rest. I rode through the chaparrals, and found a number of their dead bodies, not yet cold. The features, in every instance, were composed and tranquil—lying upon their backs, eyes closed, and feet crossed. You would have supposed them sleeping, but for the gory stream which bedewed the turf around them. In some instances, after the vital spark had fled, in the overflow of demoniac vengeance, *the carbine ball dashed out the brains of its clayey victim.*"

"The army condemns the bloody deed, and, but through the agency of Capt. Coffee, of our regiment, who rallied his men, and stepped between the victims and their executioners, *seventeen others would certainly have been killed*, who were brought by him into camp."

We gather the following from the Boston Times of May 11, 1847 :—

By a letter from Gen. Taylor of the 4th April, it appears that a party of Americans, under Col. Mitchell's command, the 1st Ohio U. S. Dragoons, and Texas Rangers, made prisoners of 24 Mexicans at *Guellapea*, *gave them a mock trial by night, and then shot them through the head!*

We pity those who are compelled to place themselves under such a "*safeguard*" for protection, either in their persons or their property. And bitter experience has taught the poor Mexicans, that it has been thus far no better than that afforded to sheep, by a pack of hungry wolves. And many disgraceful outrages are already reported to have been committed upon the defenceless inhab-

itants of Vera Cruz by their new *guardians*, whose only bond is their "honor."

As General Scott has actually inflicted punishment upon "*several*" Americans for outrages upon "the unoffending inhabitants of the country," we cheerfully make room for his own account of the matter. In imitation of General Taylor, and other American commanders, on the 11th of April, General Scott issued a proclamation "*to the good People of Mexico*," assuring them—among other things—that "Americans are not their enemies,"—in which he says:—

"For the Church of Mexico, the unoffending inhabitants of the country and their property, I have from the first, done everything in my power to place them under the safeguard of martial law against the few bad men in this army."

"My orders, to that effect, known to all, are precise and rigorous. Under them, several Americans have already been punished by fine, for the benefit of Mexicans, besides imprisonment; and one, for a rape, has been hung by the neck."

In the next paragraph he triumphantly asks—

"Is this not a proof of good faith and energetic discipline?"

But alas! for both his "good faith and energetic discipline," it turns out,—as we learn from the Vera Cruz Eagle of April 15th,—that the *one* who has been hung was a *colored man* by the name of Kirk. Had he been white—judging from what was done at Matamoras, Monterey, Mier, and other places—he would have done what he did, with entire impunity. And we have yet to learn that a single one of the hundreds of white "*miscreants*" who are guilty of the same thing, have been punished at all. But this man was not a soldier, as his color was a legal bar to his enlistment. He was only a camp follower. Nor is it that the commission of rape, at the present day, by the Americans, either in Mexico, or on their own plantations,

is a crime, *per se*, that poor Kirk was executed. His crime consisted in not being of the *right complexion* rather than the *rape*; and it was for assuming the prerogatives of a white American, and doing what they alone, claim the right to do, that he was "hung by the neck." All these professions of friendship, are a sham and a cheat; as such professions from such men ever must be. After having murdered them by thousands, pillaged, and destroyed scores of their cities, towns and villages—committed upon their families "all kinds of outrages," and robbed them of more than half their entire country—the Captain of this gang of freebooters—pausing for a moment in his work of carnage and plunder, *seizes a poor black man, hangs him by the neck for venturing to exercise the privileges of a white man*, and then very coolly tells the Mexicans, that "Americans are not their enemies!" and that he has "done everything in his power" to protect both them and their property: and triumphantly points them to this hanging as a proof.

As additional evidence of what was stated in the outset—that the design of the Government, in making this war, was conquest—and conquest too for the basest of all purposes, the attention of the reader is called to the following paragraph from the President's last annual message:—

"It may be proper to provide for the *security* of these important *conquests* by making an appropriation for the purpose of erecting *fortifications* and defraying the expenses necessarily incident to the *maintenance of our possession and authority over them.*"

Now if the President only wanted to drive *invaders* out of Texas—who were never in it—and to make Mexico pay her debts, what did he *mean* by calling upon Congress to erect fortifications for "securing our possession and authority" over "these important *conquests*?" Did he mean to yield these "conquests," fortifications and all, as

soon as the *invaders* were driven off, and Mexico had paid her debts? Nonsense! He meant no such thing. He meant, and so did the nation, to conquer Mexico and swallow her up, for having committed the unpardonable sin of abolishing slavery. And after overrunning two-thirds of her territory with incarnate devils—mad with whiskey—madder for the extension of slavery, and satiating their lusts, and glutting their love of plunder with the “*beauty and booty*” of Matamoras, Monterey, and multitudes of other places, the President sent *Senor Atocha*, a renegade Mexican, to that government with the modest offer to pay them about the valuation of the town of New Bedford,* Mass., for *three quarters of the entire Republic of Mexico*, for the purpose of seeking, in her refusal to sell herself, an occasion for further aggression. Mexico refused of course, as every body well knew she would, and Scott, at the head of the invaders, was sent to finish the work of conquest. From the city of Vera Cruz he marched upon the Capitol. He met the Mexican army, under Santa Anna, at Sierra Gorda, and a battle ensued on the 18th of April, in which, according to the official dispatch of General Scott, 250 Americans, and 350 Mexicans were maimed and murdered.

The Americans are still pursuing the work of conquest, with appetites sharpened by plunder, and lusts inflamed with blood. Were they fighting in a good cause—were they battling in defence of their hearth-stones and family altars, which had been invaded by a cruel foe, they never would have disgraced their cause, by committing atrocities so revolting to humanity, as those perpetrated by the American soldiers upon the unarmed Mexican peasants and their defenceless families. But as we have fairly de-

* Fifteen millions of dollars.

monstrated, that the cause in which they are fighting is the blackest under Heaven, it follows that the most depraved and wicked, of our race are fighting, it. Good men never fight in a bad cause; and good men are not fighting in this. On the contrary, the nation has vomited up from the kennels and sinks of pollution, the lowest moral forms of human life,—embracing both the dregs and scum of society—and sent it forth—a burning lava-flood of desolation, wasting and destroying the country of our Mexican brothers,—but recently consecrated to universal liberty.

There has been much said since the commencement of this war calculated to excite the prejudices of the ignorant against the Mexicans. They have been represented as a race of semibarbarians, ignorant of everything that can enoble and bless our race. For the purpose of stemming this tide of bitter prejudice, we here insert an extract from the recently published work of Mr. Thompson, late American Minister to Mexico. He says:—

“On the 16th of June, 1842, the Texan prisoners of the Santa Fe expedition were released by General Santa Anna, that being his birth-day, or rather the anniversary of his saint (Saint Antonio,) which is the day kept by all Mexicans instead of their own birth-day. I knew that they were to be released on that day, on the parade ground near the city, and fearing that the immense populace which would be assembled might offer them some violence, I went out, knowing that my official station would protect me, and might enable me to protect them. Never was fear more groundless, or a surprise more agreeable. Santa Anna reviewed on that occasion a body of more than ten thousand troops; and there were not less than thirty or forty thousand other persons assembled in the field. When the order for their liberation was given, it was received with acclamations and shouts by the Mexican troops, which extended through the whole vast concourse. The officers and others threw pieces of money to the Texans, and as they passed through the crowd, instead of jeers and insults,

every Mexican had a word of kindness for them, running up to them and shaking hands, and exclaiming, "amigo, amigo"—my friend, my friend! I saw one poor lepero pull off his blanket and offer it to a Texan who was rather more ragged than he was himself. As they passed along the streets, men and women would run out from their shops and offer them bread and other articles. Let it be remembered that these men had invaded their country, and that they had been sedulously taught to regard them as their born enemies; los Texanos (the Texans) having all the associations with a Mexican that the words los Moros (the Moors) had with their Gothic ancestors. I could not refrain from asking myself whether, if the people of any other country had invaded ours and been made prisoners, they would under like circumstances have passed through such a crowd not only without insult, but with such demonstrations of kindness and sympathy."

"An incident occurred while the prisoners were confined in Tacubaya, which is characteristic, not only of the Mexicans of both sexes, but of women every where. On one occasion, and it was one of the very first exceptions to the remark which I have just made, a subaltern Mexican officer struck a Texan who was at work on the streets; a young lady of one of the most respectable families, and I sincerely regret that I have forgotten her name, who happened to be passing by, called the officer to her, and asked him if he was a Mexican by birth. He replied that he was not. She said 'I am rejoiced to hear it, sir, and I did not suppose that you were, for I did not believe that any Mexican would be guilty of so cowardly an act as to strike a prisoner who dare not return the blow.'"

We also give some further favorable notices, which seem to have been extorted from their authors.

From the Boston Daily Mail.

"NOBLE CONDUCT.—A correspondent of a cotemporary, writing from Vera Cruz, gives the following account of an incident, of a character which we love to record. 'Our blockading squadron are daily capturing prizes. I cannot forbear mentioning a circumstance which is alike honorable

to the Mexicans and our officers, which robs war of some of its sterner and more repulsive features. When hostilities were opened, and the blockade announced, Gen. Bravo, in opposition to the advice of a council of his officers, permitted all the American vessels in port to depart without molestation, and allowed them eight days to close up their concerns before leaving. Yesterday, the Somers and the Falmouth each captured a valuable prize, under the Mexican flag. A Colonel of the army was passenger in one of them. Captain Gregory, commanding the squadron, deemed this a suitable opportunity to acknowledge the courtesy of the Mexican General. He, therefore, released both of the prizes, and despatched a graceful and appropriate note to Gen. Bravo, informing him that he had been told of his liberal conduct towards our vessels—and, as an act of such generous magnanimity could not be permitted to pass unnoticed by an American officer, that we had the honor of returning to him the two vessels which had become lawful prizes to our squadron. I need not say that all the squadron cordially acquiesced in this timely reciprocation of the forbearance and honorable conduct of the Mexicans.' ”

From the New-York Journal of Commerce.

MEXICO.

“ There are three encouraging facts concerning the Mexicans stated by our late Minister, Mr. Thompson, viz : The good character of the women, the general temperance of the people, and the ability of nearly all of them to read and write. The women (he observes) in their manners are perfect, and in the great attributes of the heart,—affection, kindness and benevolence, in all their forms—they have no superiors. He thinks that in the most important point they have been much slandered, and there is no city in Europe of the same size, where there is less immorality, than in Mexico.”

“ ‘ I am sure,’ he says, ‘ that during my residence in Mexico, I did not see a dozen men drunk, and I have seen assemblies of fifty and a hundred thousand people without one case of drunkenness. As to intemperance among respectable people, it is almost unknown.’ Again, ‘ I had not a servant during my residence in Mexico who did not

read and write—neither very well, it is true, but quite as well or better than the same class in this country. I often observed the most ragged leppers, as they walked down the streets, reading the signs over the store doors. How this happens, I know not, unless it be the effect of the Lancasterian schools which are established all over the country.' ”

A correspondent of the *New Orleans Delta*, giving an account of the battle of Monterey, says :—

“ During the progress of the seige of Monterey, there were constant and affecting evidences of the kindness the Mexican women afforded to the soldiers of the American army—to the regulars as well as volunteers. When our men and officers were passing through the streets of the city, during the most exciting intervals of the battle, they would run out of their houses with baskets filled with bread and cakes of different kinds, and distribute the contents amongst the officers and soldiers, without the reception of fee or reward for their kindness. And it can be easily imagined that these were highly acceptable donations, inasmuch as many of us at the time were very much reduced in our stock of provisions. There were also many of us, during the seige and after we had entered the city, placed in different yards in the place, where we fired from the tops of the houses upon the Mexican troops, who were stationed in the public squares or plazas.”

“ Here, too, our toils and lassitudes were greatly soothed by the tender assiduities of the Mexican females. There were some of them still remaining in the houses which backed upon these yards, who cheerfully tendered their services to cook for us, receiving a small amount of compensation from those who had money, and to those who were destitute of means, handing food without any reward whatever.”

“ The humanity of the Mexican women was also brightly manifested during the most intense heat of the action, in causing the wounded among the American soldiers to be removed out of the streets, where they laid weltering in their blood, into their houses, where they carefully and tenderly dressed their wounds, and provided them with food and drink. They also evinced the most ardent devo-

tion to such of the wounded soldiers on the American side as were taken prisoners by the Mexicans, and sent to their hospital. They dressed their wounds, washed their clothes, and brought them fruit of different kinds, without any charge for their pains."

The Mexicans then, are not wild beasts, but men—brother men; whom we are bound by every principle of justice, humanity, and religion, to love and protect, rather than to hate and destroy. And would the limits and designs of this work permit, we would show that in temperance, humanity, and national justice, they are far superior to the nation which is now grinding them to powder. But we forbear. An impartial future is yet to sit in judgment on the character of this nation, which in regard to its privileges, has been exalted to Heaven, but which, by its crimes and oppressions, has thrust itself down to Hell.

ERRATA.

Page 35, ninth line from the bottom, the following words in *Italics*—*Acts of Congress*—were designed for the heading of a chapter.

Page 79, twelfth line from the bottom, for unanimously, read unceremoniously.

Page 79, fifth line from the bottom, for freaks, read pricks.